

PRAXIS AND PREACHING: THE DEVELOPMENT OF RIGHTEOUSNESS AS
SOLIDARITY WITHIN THE BIBLICAL TRADITION AND ITS VALUE TO
A CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

A Professional Project
Presented to
the Faculty of the
School of Theology at Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Ministry

by
Robert Gordon Hall
June 1977

This professional project, completed by

Robert Gordon Hall,
*has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty
of the School of Theology at Claremont in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

Faculty Committee

Reyes Minier
K. Morgan Edwards

April 26, 1977
Date

Joseph C. Hoagh
Dean

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to my Project Committee, composed of Drs. Rolf Knierim and K. Morgan Edwards, for their guidance in the completion of this paper. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Knierim for planting the seed of righteousness as solidarity in my consciousness.

I am also grateful to Dr. Loren Fisher, who guided this Project at its inception, and to Dr. Henry Kuizenga, who helped me define the role of Biblical preaching.

A debt of gratitude is owed to Michele Jolley for typing my Project and for keeping the faith through thick and thin. Finally, I would like to express my love to my wife, Linda, for her anger and her encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE EXEGETICAL TASK.....	11
A. The Development of Righteousness as Solid- arity within the Realm of Relationships.....	11
1. Historical Outline.....	11
a. The Foundations of Israel's History.....	11
b. Kinship and Corporate Responsibility in the Days of the Judges.....	15
c. The Rights and Duties of the King in the Early Monarchy.....	20
d. Ethical Conduct in the Time of the Prophets.....	24
e. Individual Responsibility during the Exile and beyond.....	28
2. Systematic Conclusions.....	32
a. The Tribal System.....	32
b. Covenant.....	37
c. Kingship.....	42
d. Law.....	47
e. Wisdom; Creation.....	53
B. Righteousness as Solidarity in the Teachings of Paul.....	59
1. The Old Testament in the New.....	59
a. The Israelite Tradition.....	59
b. Foundations for a Universal History.....	63

2. Righteousness as a Relational Realm of Reality in the Early Church.....	65
3. Individual and Corporate Responsibility as Christians.....	68
III. THE HOMILETICAL ADVENTURE.....	70
A. Translating the Past into Sermonic Form.....	70
1. Dante's Garden.....	71
2. A Royal Partnership.....	81
3. Christian Solidarity.....	90
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	99

ABSTRACT

The focus of the Project is on the concept of righteousness as solidarity within the Biblical tradition and in preaching. One of the underlying presuppositions is that righteousness as solidarity has tremendous potential for the quality of life in a modern Christian community.

The problem is that the Hebrew words '*tsedeq*', '*ts^edaqah*', and '*tsadiq*' are not commensurate with the English terms 'righteousness' or 'being righteous'. H. Cremer, at the beginning of this century, correctly proposed that righteousness express relationships rather than a standard or norm. Professor Rolf Knierim has taken a further step by equating solidarity with righteousness. While the former generally represented the horizontal plane of relationships in the Old Testament, that is fellowship and kinship, the latter often conveyed a vertical relationship between God and man. Solidarity as righteousness is understood as the intersection of those planes. In an age of polarization between the importance of one's spiritual relationship with God and social concern for one's fellow human beings, righteousness as solidarity has potential significance.

The Biblical tradition, in both the Old and New Testaments, offers witness to the theory that righteousness as solidarity is the intersection of the vertical and hori-

zontal dimensions of life. The investigation of the Biblical tradition is historical and sociological within a theological framework. The transformation of relationships is traced from early Israelite tribal society to the religious communities of the early church. Within the context of the Old Testament, there are concepts which relate to righteousness as solidarity. These are the tribal society, covenant, kingship, law, wisdom, and creation. St. Paul, in his Letter to the Romans, formulated his own expression of righteousness as solidarity, although heavy dependence upon his Jewish heritage is evident.

When the exegetical task is complete, the homiletical adventure begins. The Biblical tradition confronts the modern preacher with a vastly different socio-historical situation. The burden, therefore, falls upon the preacher to translate the Biblical meaning of righteousness as solidarity into the modern socio-historical situation while maintaining the intentionality of the ancient author. Dialogue between the past and the present offers opportunities for the enrichment of both.

Plans are being made to preach the three sermons included in this Project. The preaching of these sermons can initiate a creative process by which righteousness as solidarity becomes actualized in a modern Christian community.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

If we were to seek a concept pertaining to the quality of human life, few Biblical terms would hold greater significance than *'tsedeq'*, *'ts^edaqaḥ'*, or *'tsadiq'* - appearing some 481 times in Biblica Hebraica. This Semitic word has been variously translated as 'just' or 'justice', 'legitimacy', 'charity', 'vindication', 'rightness', but most often as 'righteousness' or 'being righteous'.

The problem arises in the fact that righteousness, as a relational concept, is often misunderstood and unappreciated within a Christian community (or congregation), as well as being inadequate to convey the full meaning of *ts^edaqaḥ*. Although it is a matter of earnest debate whether any one term is adequate, this writer proposes to follow Professor Rolf Knierim's proposal that 'solidarity' be synonymous with righteousness. However, it will become clear that righteousness may be understood as solidarity only within certain contexts. How then are we to understand these terms? The word righteousness in the Old Testament (hereafter OT) sometimes conveyed a vertical relationship (speaking mythologically) between God and man, while solidarity in the OT indicated a sense of kinship or fellowship. The latter represented the horizontal plane of relationships. These classifications are not necessarily exclusive of one

another. It is this writer's proposal that when we understand righteousness as solidarity, we are describing the intersection of the vertical and the horizontal planes. Righteousness as solidarity is thus the fulfilling of a two-dimensional relationship with God and one's fellow man. The meaning of praxis is being broadened from 'interpersonal relationships' to include relationship with God.

The exegetical problem arises in doing justice to the intent of the original Biblical or Near Eastern authors while determining a meaning which is significant for a Christian community in the Twentieth Century. Gerhard von Rad wrote concerning *ts^edaqah*:

It is the standard not only for man's relationship to God, but also for his relationship to his fellows, reaching right down to the most petty wranglings - indeed, it is even the standard for man's relationship to the animals and to his natural environment. *Ts^edaqah* can be described without more ado as the highest value in life, that upon which all life rests when it is properly ordered.¹

Ts^edaqah as solidarity is also to be understood as a relational concept which is integrally related to world-order. This is a vital issue which speaks to the concern for "Global Responsibility in a Developing World". We shall see that individual responsibility is nurtured within a social context.

It is this writer's belief that preaching is an effective means by which a pastor may communicate the value of righteousness as solidarity to his/her community. The development of a two-dimensional (Biblical) concept in a sermon

¹Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), I, 370.

must be integrated with life situations. Does righteousness itself represent a credible concept for preachers in the Twentieth Century? However, it is my belief that when the original experience and a contemporary situation have been honestly compared, the ancient word will speak its authentic message to new forms in which that human situation has found expression in modern times. The development of righteousness as solidarity in the first part will be integrated with its expression in the second.

The quality of literature (in several languages) pertaining to *ts^edaqah* is enormous, therefore, it will be necessary to limit the scope of this Project. *Ts^edaqah* was known throughout the ancient Near East with a variety of meanings. Ugarit holds special significance for its understanding in the OT. Although a cursory examination of the background of *ts^edaqah* will reveal similarities, this term developed distinctive theological characteristics in the OT. *Ts^edaqah* survived in Jewish Intertestamental literature (Midrash, Talmud, etc.) and in the Septuagint as '*dikaïosune*'. Although righteousness is an important concept in the teachings of Jesus, our concern shall be focused on Paul's teaching in Romans which places heavy dependence on both the Old and the New Testaments (hereafter NT). Augustine and Luther, among many notables of church history, were concerned about *ts^edaqah* and *dikaïosune*; however, their contributions lie beyond the scope of this Project. Righteousness intriguingly borders upon the realm of ethics - its relation to

sin - and sociological anthropology - the individual in relation to his/her social environment.

First, let us understand what is meant by *tsēdeq* and *ts^edaqah*, which may not be used interchangeably. *Tsēdeq* is related to world-order, while *ts^edaqah* is related to attitudes and behavior in accord with world-order. Either Hebrew word, regardless of its translation, presupposes its relation to cosmic world-order. Righteousness, as has been previously implied, is inadequate in making this distinction and does not communicate to the modern reader the 'protological preunderstanding' implied in the word (*Knierim*). Righteousness is all too often defined by its forensic meaning, which is limited to judgement or justice. H. Cremer, at the turn of this century, provided the ingenious clue to the broader meaning of righteousness, as Eichrodt interprets his thesis:

"...as a concept of relation referring to an actual relationship between two persons and implying behavior which corresponds to, or is true to, the claims arising out of such a relationship."²

Cremer's theory, despite its relative antiquity, has generally prevailed. Elizabeth Achtemeier, in more recent studies, has defined the terms *ts^edaqah* and *dikaïosune* in the OT and NT respectively in accord with Cremer's theory:

"Rather, righteousness is in the OT the fulfillment of the demands of a relationship, whether that relationship be with men or with God. Each man is set within a multitude of relationships: king with people, judge with complaintants, priests with worshipers, common man with family, tribesman with community, community with resident alien and poor, all with God. And each of these relationships brings with it specific demands, the fulfillment of which constitutes righteousness. The

²Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), I, 240.

demands may differ from relationship to relationship; righteousness in one situation may be unrighteousness in another. Further, there is no norm of righteousness outside of the relationship itself. When God or man fulfills the conditions imposed upon him by a relationship, he is, in OT terms, righteous."³

"...God, who in his grace desires fellowship with men, chose the people of Israel promised to be their God (and therefore save them), and Israel promised to be his people (and therefore obey Him). Through human rebellion and sin, this covenant was broken, and since only the innocent party (in this case, God), can reestablish a broken covenant, man cannot restore the broken covenant with God. Though the Jews held that the law embodied the demands which the covenant relationship with God laid upon man, once that covenant relationship is abrogated through sin, the law is powerless to restore man to fellowship with God...But through Christ, God has reestablished the covenant relationship, thus making it possible for men to have fellowship with God. This restored relationship lays a two-fold demand on men: that they admit their failure, through sin, to uphold the covenant with God (repentance), and accept the restored covenant relationship as an act based, not on their merit, but on God's grace (faith). In addition to accepting this fellowship within the community that God's act calls into being (the church)."⁴

In these lengthy definitions, Achtemeier has clearly shown that *ts^edaqah* and *dikaïosune* are relational concepts.

A Christian community, unlike other institutions, is blessed with the Judeo-Christian heritage, as well as the promise of a covenant relationship reestablished through Christ. We would fulfill the demands of the relationship not because of the requirements of the law or our own merits, but rather, in faith. It is within the context of a Christian community that solidarity takes on special significance.

Solidarity does not merely represent a feeling of oneness or

³Elizabeth Achtemeier, "Righteousness in the OT", in Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, IV, 80.

⁴Paul Achtemeier, "Righteousness in the NT," in Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, IV, 92.

togetherness, but rather, "...an entire union of interests and responsibilities in a group: community of interests, objectives, or standards."⁵ Solidarity is at a disadvantage over the term righteousness, as the act of being solidary (by definition) is limited to Scots and Roman civil law. As Christians bound by the new covenant, righteousness becomes not only solidarity with God, but also solidarity with a community. The focus of solidarity as a relational concept is broadened from personal (or particularistic) concerns to community of global (universal) concerns. Solidarity must be understood as a gift of God, who is both creator and sustainer of the world. Our priorities are not only with world-order, but also attitudes and behavior that are in accord with world-order.

However, this study of righteousness as solidarity must not be confined to the ethereal realm of semantics, but instead, related to daily life within a Christian community - if it is to become meaningful as a mode of being. There recently arose a crisis of minor proportion which speaks to this issue. On the Sunday before Christmas, a mother and her five children joined a particular church in the morning service. During the afternoon of the same day, the children's department of the Sunday school put on a Christmas pageant. Two of the boys of that family who were supposed to be involved in the pageant were caught by the church custodian doing something else which they should not have been doing. The custodian took it upon himself to

⁵Webster's Third New International Dictionary:
Unabridged, (Springfield: G.&.C. Merriam Company, Publishers, 1966), p. 2169.

punish the boys. When the mother heard a greatly exaggerated report from her sons, she immediately withdrew her family from active participation in the church and demanded the dismissal of the custodian. The pastor later confronted the custodian and told him that he must either apologize to the mother or be dismissed. The custodian admitted that he was wrong in punishing the children himself. In an attempt to make amends with the mother, he apologized to her; but she refused to accept his apology. She refused to re-enter the church as long as he remained employed there.

This situation, which is surely not unusual, poses several questions to this writer. Should a pastor dismiss a chief custodian in order to bring a single member back into the fold, or should a pastor retain the custodian at the loss of a member (and her family)? Although there are several solutions to the problem (none of which we will concern ourselves with here), it is the role of relationships with which we are concerned. Does admittance of guilt and an attempt to restore a right relationship constitute righteousness? If that same person refused to admit guilt or make reconciliation, would that person then not be unrighteous? Being righteous is often confused with self-centeredness or pharisaism, which is being convinced of one's own righteousness and being more moral than others. It appears to this writer that this is a situation to which a pastor may speak to his/her congregation educating them regarding the value

of righteousness as solidarity. Although there are civil laws governing the handling of children in schools and other institutions, *ts^edaqah* is not an 'ethical norm' to which just members of a Christian community are subject. Parents, teachers, pastors and staff, as well as members of the congregation, must work together. This is the value of righteousness as solidarity for a Christian community. Although Achtemeier has written (of the OT), '...Each man is set within a multitude of relationships...And each of these relationships brings with it specific demands, the fulfillment of which constitutes righteousness', it is not entirely by our own efforts that we meet the demands of these relationships. Within the Methodist tradition, we pray during the service of the Lord's Supper: 'We do not presume to come to this thy table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies.' How well do we understand the words which we pray together as a Christian community? This case study in the life of a particular Christian community perhaps demonstrates only one of many sets of circumstances in which there is a need for clarification of a viable concept which conveys the responsibilities of relationships within a community.

Righteousness is generally translated by the German word '*Gerechtigkeit*', while solidarity is usually translated by '*Solidarität*'. Although we note exceptions to this, our hypothesis requires the preunderstanding that both righteousness and solidarity may be translated by *Gerechtigkeit*.

The sources from which we shall draw upon are Hans Schmid's Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung (Righteousness as World-Order) and Christian Müller's Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk (The Righteousness of God and the People of God). These sources were exceedingly helpful in formulating an outline of the subject. The former traces of the OT and ancient Near Eastern concepts of righteousness, while the latter focuses upon righteousness in the Book of Romans. Walther Eichrodt's Theology of the Old Testament and Gerhard von Rad's Old Testament Theology will each in their own way be instrumental in shedding light upon righteousness as solidarity. Russell Philip Shedd has written a comprehensive study on St. Paul's Conception of Old Testament and New Testament Solidarity. J. Ziesler has written an important work in The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul. Karl Barth's Epistle to the Romans is an equally valuable resource. Finally, E. Achtemeier has recently published The Old Testament and Proclamation of the Gospel in which she outlines the integrative factors in the Old and New Testaments, as well as their values for preaching.

This project initially was undertaken as a response to Bultmann's charge that the OT is a history of failure and is, therefore, not a Christian book. Although this statement will not be answered directly, this is a secondary concern which lies beneath the surface of this study. This is an issue which is pertinent to ministry in a Christian community, especially for one who is concerned for the viability

of the message of the OT. Righteousness as solidarity is a thread which runs through the fabric of the entire OT and NT. It is as this one idea among many is traced that dialogue between the Testaments becomes possible. It is also reasonable that those concepts in the OT which are of value for clarification of similar concepts in the NT should be developed.

Our first task will be to examine *ts^edaqah* in ancient Near Eastern and OT sources, particularly within the context of the tribal system, covenant, creation/wisdom, kingship, and law. The development of *ts^edaqah* will be traced from the days of the Judges to Qumran. *Dikaïosune* emerges in Romans displaying heavy dependence upon both Old and New Testament sources. When the exegetical task is completed, the homilectical adventure begins. There really can be delight for a preacher who leads his/her congregation on a journey from the minds of the Biblical authors to the minds and hearts of every listener who is concerned about his/her role within a Christian community. Solidarity within a covenant relationship expresses a 'union of interests and responsibilities' which a pastor has the privilege of proclaiming to his/her community. It is only as a Christian witnesses personally or as a member of a community that praxis or relationships between persons or between God and persons becomes a manifestation of world-order.

Chapter II

THE EXEGETICAL TASK

A. THE DEVELOPMENT OF RIGHTEOUSNESS AS SOLIDARITY IN
ANCIENT ISRAEL WITHIN THE REALM OF RELATIONSHIPS1. Historical Outline

a. The Foundations of Israel's History. While it may be possible to claim that Israel's history as a nation began at Shechem (Joshua 24)¹, we cannot ignore the traditions in the memory of the people about the Patriarchs, the liberation from Egypt, the covenant at Sinai, the wandering in the Wilderness, and finally, the entry into the Land. Although a comprehensive analysis of these traditions lies beyond the scope of this Project, it is understood that these traditions and events have a bearing on Israel as a historical community, as well as the peoples' relationship to Yahweh. While solidarity is generally identified with kinship, it is not possible to view such a relationship as exclusively historical or sociological at the same time divorced from a relationship with Yahweh.

The problems with which we are concerned are essentially formulated in the question: 'How did Israel understand herself as a community in relation to her faith during the course of her history?' One may well wonder whether it is possible to divide a theology of the Old Testament into

¹A theory proposed by Prof. Loren Fisher in a class on The History of Israel (February, 1976).

"God and the People", "God and the World", and "God and Man", as Walther Eichrodt has done. Adopting this methodology from his mentor, Otto Procksch, Eichrodt's treatment has certain advantages, as well as disadvantages, in comparison with von Rad's history of traditions approach. Eichrodt's emphasis upon the linear use of the covenant throughout Israel's history lacks depth of understanding. Yet Eichrodt is correct in seeking a concept which expresses the reality of relationships between persons, as well as between God and persons. Ciphers, such as treaty, pact, and communion (Vriezen), have also been proposed, but none are consistent.

Solidarity is not proposed here as an all-inclusive cipher, but rather as one expression of relationships among many. The early Israelites remembered their semi-nomadic ancestors. Neither the Israelites nor their ancestors were ever true bedouins, that is camel breeders, despite their wanderings in the wilderness. Any comparison with the modern day bedouin, such as Mendenhall and de Vaux have made, must be done with great discretion. Other comparisons, such as the "Sacral Confederation" or "amphictynony" which Noth employs by analogy with the Greek and Roman city-states (also based on the number 12) does not appear justified. This, in fact, exemplifies part of the problem in defining a people distinctive in their relationship with their God. Extra-Biblical sources must be used with cau-

tion for application to a history of Israel.

The foci of our investigation will be social and historical within a theological framework. Eichrodt and von Rad have examined from different perspectives the position of an individual within the community. It is clear that a person understood him-/herself as a part of the collective group - as a representative of the whole - rather than as an individual. A person felt a very strong sense of solidarity within the family, the clan, and the tribe.² Nomadism or semi-nomadism fosters a sense of community through blood relations. The complexity of the extended family in the OT is portrayed in Leviticus 18:6ff³. However, the kinship affords protection for the male or female within the tribal unit. While this allows a person certain freedom, he is also restricted by his responsibility for the welfare of the other members of the community. Solidarity is more than a feeling of 'oneness' or fellowship. Eichrodt has written:

"...the striking fundamental characteristic of all forms of community in the ancient world, and in particular those of Israel, namely the strength of their sense of solidarity - a sense which adjusts itself in a variety of ways to changes in the shape of society, but is always the essential determinant of its distinctive quality. In interplay with this solidarity, we find a living individuality which, as distinct from individualism, is to be understood as the capacity for personal responsibility and for shaping one's own life. This does not stand in mutually exclusive opposition to, but in fruitful tension with, the duty of solidarity, as such, motivates the individual and motivates his conduct."⁴

²Walther Eichrodt has admitted his debt to J. Scharbert for his thorough research in the area of 'solidarity-thinking' by the tribal societies of the ancient Near East.

³J.R. Porter, The Extended Family in the Old Testament (London: Edutext, 1967).

⁴W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), II, 232.

Within the unique Israelite traditions, it is the "god of the Fathers" and Yahweh who motivate the conduct of the individual. In the later Elohist tradition of Ex 3:13-15, we find a reference which attempts to identify Yahweh with the god of the fathers. In Exodus 6:2-3, we find a different (Priestly) tradition: "God said to Moses, 'I am Yahweh. I revealed myself to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as *Eł Šadday*, but was not known to them by my name Yahweh.'" These suggest that a variety of traditions were passed down from generation to generation. The Biblical narrative is not explicit, but it appears that the Hebrews adopted Yahwism from the Kenites (Midianites) who were related to Moses through his father-in-law. Yahweh was early known as "the One of Sinai" (Jud. 5:4f; Ps. 68:8). Although a tribal society continued beyond the organization of the people of Israel, the memories of Exodus and Sinai were founded upon historical events. These traditions about the Sinai covenant with Yahweh remembered by a few survivors became normative for all. The first factor is this very real, historical experience which gave Israel her identity. This relationship is summarized in Ex 6:6-8:

Say therefore to the people of Israel, 'I am the LORD, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will deliver you from their bondage, and I will redeem you with an outstretched arm and with great acts of judgement, and I will take you for my people, and I will be your God; and you shall know that I am the LORD your God, who has brought you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians. And I will bring you into the land which I swore to give to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; I will give it to you for a possession. I am the LORD'.

Although this declaration was originally without historical or territorial perspective, it gained such a perspective after the fact. The second factor which contributed to Israel's identity was the fact that Yahweh was understood as being radically different from the nature gods of Israel's neighbors. Yet Yahweh was equally as capable of acting in nature as he had acted in history.

It is important to observe that right relationships within a tribal community became the foundation for a right relationship with Yahweh. A right relationship and moral conduct are integrally related. The "solidarity-thinking" of the tribes was not abandoned but instead incorporated into a right relationship with Yahweh.

Just as in secular life the ties formed by blood-relationship could be extended by means of connubium, of treaty, or of adoption in the sense of a fictitious consanguinity, so the unification of the tribes into the people of Yahweh brought about an enlargement of the circle of those linked by solidarity, creating a new physical and psychical whole within which an inward bond of a higher sort held the members of the covenant together with the firmness of a clan community.⁵

The genealogical unity of the tribes and the religious association became influential forces in binding the people together. Solidarity is clearly to be seen as a functioning in the tribal society of the Hebrews.

b. Kinship and Corporate Responsibility in the Days of the Judges. The settlement of the tribes of Israel, however, brought about significant changes in societal life. Whatever one's interpretation of the Conquest may be -

⁵Ibid., II, 238.

whether by gradual absorption or violent attack⁶ - the changes caused radical revisions in tribal solidarity. This would naturally occur when any group of people moves from a rural to an urban culture of feudal city-states. In some instances, this was a gradual process, since certain city-states were able to hold out for more than two centuries. Nevertheless, the villages and walled cities of the Canaanite feudal system gradually replaced the tent communities of former days. A person could no longer depend upon the protection or the welfare of his/her family. The widow was often no longer able to return to her father's house. It would be the responsibility of the judge to protect the rights of the individual within the urban culture, but his efforts were far from adequate. The plight of the poor, the widow, the orphan, and the alien became a constant problem. The consequence of these developments was that:

"...the sense of solidarity was transferred from the clan to the family; and within this smaller group the individuality of each member of the family was able to make itself more strongly felt."⁷

The family is no longer accountable for the guilt of one of its members. This represents an attempt to limit punishment to the one who is really guilty.

⁶G.E. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine", Biblical Archeologist, XXV:3 (1962), 66-87.

⁷Eichrodt, II, 240.

There were many traditions of J,E,D and P which interpreted the actions of Yahweh, the Patriarchs, and the Hebrews as righteous (*tsadiq*). Righteousness (*ts^edaqah*), however, was not a concept developed early in Israel's history. Righteousness is not to be understood as a formal, abstract concept of objectifying a norm or standard of behavior, but rather, represents relationships between two persons corresponding right behavior. Justice, or sociality, (*Knierim*) denotes the rights and duties arising out of these relationships. It is the obligation of righteousness to render this justice to the other person. Understood in a forensic sense, justice is also the administration of these rights and duties. Justice thus becomes the practical application of righteousness.

Righteousness is not limited exclusively to the affairs of man. Yahweh is also understood as being righteous. During the Conquest, Yahweh watched over the justice of his people, and a victory for the Israelites meant that Yahweh was establishing his righteousness. Yahweh and his activity as Judge were synonymous. Within Israel, Yahweh was also understood as the protector of the needy. While there were deities in the ancient Near East who were understood as guardians of justice, none could be so utterly depended upon as Yahweh. He was not fickle in his administration of justice. The passage of time from the Exodus onwards gave greater assurance of the consistent pattern of

Yahweh's justice. As the people of Israel absorbed foreigners into their midst, the aliens also might benefit from Yahweh's righteous activity. While we may not view Yahweh's destruction of Israel's enemies as just, the victories for the authors of the Biblical narrative were manifestations of Israel's divine election.

Although much of the history of the period of the Judges is known to us only through the later redaction of the Deuteronomistic school - particularly Judges 2:6 - I Samuel 12. This is essentially a record of Yahweh's saving history. While these theological stories reflect the activity of charismatic leaders whom Yahweh has raised up in response to a particular situation, these individuals were actually little more than brigands and power-hungry leaders. These Judges were: Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Deborah, Barak, Gideon, Abimelech, Tola, Jair, Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, Abdon, and Samson. These Judges represented tribal concerns, since these men and women did not wield power over all the tribes of Israel. Within that region a clan or clans would follow the Judge until his/her death, then fall back into their former ways. When Yahweh handed those clans over to their enemies, the clans raised up a cry so that Yahweh would once again send them a charismatic leader. Although much of the cyclical material represents the Seventh Century theologizing of the Deuteronomic school, certain portions, such as the of Deborah (Judges 5), are perceived to be very early con-

structions. Joshua was perhaps the only leader to reflect a truly religious perspective, and most probably, had the widest following, since he could be identified with Moses.

The solidarity of the tribes expressed in the covenant at Shechem represented a religious coalition under Yahweh as the "God of Israel". The association of the tribes did not signify a political solidarity. No more than six tribes (Judges 4) united in "holy war" against their enemies. The tribes did, however, make annual pilgrimages to the central shrine at Bethel, then Shiloh, and finally at Gilgal. At these successive central shrines, Yahweh was worshiped at the Ark upon which he sat enthroned. Yahwism also penetrated many of the former (local) Canaanite shrines. The Israelites were thus deeply affected by the environment in which they found themselves. In the period of the Judges, the people clamored for a king, as their neighbors possessed. When the Israelites attempted to establish a theocracy, Yahweh was proclaimed as king. At the same time, the Judges were his administrators of justice. In Joshua 17-21, we note that the cry 'we have no king' is concurrent with one of the most brutal and anarchic periods in Israel's history. Bright, in opposition to Wellhausen, argues that the Kingdom of God was understood both theologically and politically. We may observe that such a theocracy simply did not work. As a result of all of their 'holy wars', the Israelite tribes concluded their forages against their enemies with

less land than which they had begun. They also always fought on the defensive. The purity of Yahwism could not be preserved from the tainting of Baalism. A process of syncretism, therefore, took place. Yet the tenacity of the tribal system persisted, despite rivalry and jealousy between the tribes. These rivalries occasionally erupted into war (Judges 12:1-6). When crimes were committed by one tribe member against another, there was no authority to provide for the extradition of the guilty party. It is indeed remarkable that the tribal federation persisted for two centuries, despite the wasteful administration of justice under the Judges.

c. The Rights and Duties of the King in the Early Monarchy. The reign of the Judges might have been continued indefinitely had it not been for the rise of the Philistine crisis. The establishment of kingship was probably an unavoidable outcome of the position in which Israel found herself. The temporary services of a charismatic leader were not sufficient. At long last the solidarity of the tribes became an actuality, though a tenuous one. We may subsume Saul, David, and Solomon under the title of 'Early Monarchy'.

The solidarity thinking of the sacral federation underwent radically new expression under Israelite kingship. Saul became the first king of Israel - having been elected at Mizpah, anointed *nagid* at Ephriam, and pronounced king at Gilgal. Saul did not have political control over a

territory, but instead served as a military king - similar to the Judges. Several of the narratives which negatively describe Saul's reign reflect later tension between Yahwism and kingship. In Saul's day, the monarchy was understood as complementary to the advancement of Yahwism.

An individual's life was still judged from the perspective of faithfulness to a relationship. Von Rad notes that the encounter between Saul and David (when David had an opportunity to slay Saul but did not) indicates that David was righteous (I Samuel 24:23). David was not living up to the standards of an ethical norm, but rather, fulfilling the demands of a relationship which he took more seriously than Saul. David could also not bring himself to raise his hand against the Lord's anointed. The king was Yahweh's representative on earth; therefore, violence against the king would have had cosmological significance. The king was understood as the guarantor of justice, as well as everything which contributed to faithfulness in community relationships. The king's judgement and righteousness are gifts to him from Yahweh (Ps. 52:1). While Saul did not exemplify all of these qualities as king, his brief reign may be understood as a precedent and a period of transition.

In the reign of David we see the conscious attempt to bring about a confluence of factors related to kingship and Yahwism. David not only responded militarily to the Philistine threat which Saul unsuccessfully encountered, but

also expanded Israel's borders far beyond what any Judge might have envisioned. David sought to form an alliance between the twelve tribes through skillful diplomacy. David's success may also be attributed to his choice of a neutral capital. Jerusalem, a Jebusite city in the hill country of Judah, had never before been conquered by the Israelites. This strategy managed to dissipate temporarily the rivalry between the tribes, as well as providing a stronger base upon which to establish a united monarchy. David, who was also a devout worshiper of Yahweh and had an adherent to the Yahwistic cult, brought the Ark himself with great pomp and ceremony to his new capital. The Ark, which was placed in a tent pitched by the spring Gehon, brought about the implementation of a central sanctuary and a political center. David combined priestly, political, and military functions as king of Israel. The Yahwistic cult became syncretized with other Jerusalem cults (El, Sedeq, and Shalim) through the influence of Canaanite residents. This was considered expedient in order to keep at a minimum the tension between Israelite and Canaanite populations. Jerusalem, which was David's own city, became an impetus towards the merger of the secular and the sacred. The institution of monarchy was, therefore, grounded upon a firmer foundation by its sacral legitimation (II Samuel 7).

Solomon became a co-regent and successor to David. In Solomon, a dynasty was founded. David was not a son of

Saul, and therefore, cannot be considered the founder of a dynasty. Solomon claimed his legitimacy from Yahweh himself (I Kings 3:4-15). Solomon inherited the largest kingdom that Israel had ever possessed. Where David had achieved success through military prowess, Solomon correspondingly achieved economic success. Although Solomon lost parts of David's empire, Solomon's foreign diplomacy, marriage alliances, and economic trade may be valued as more significant. The Deuteronomist tells us of his great wisdom and of the flowering culture during Israel's "Golden Age". It appears, at the same time, that Solomon surrounded himself with bodyguards and that he had no compunctions about liquidating his enemies. We see in Solomon the glory, as well as the ruthlessness, attendant with the monarchy. Solomon's greatest achievement may be perceived in his erection of the Temple for Yahweh. The Ark was moved from its tent near the spring of Gehon to the Holy of Holies in the splendid edifice on the top of the hill. This symbolized that the urbanization or sedentary process of the people of Israel was firmly established, if not complete. Yahweh now dwelt in a house within the city of Jerusalem. Solomon built his palace adjacent to the Temple, so that the Temple became the property of the Davidic dynasty and a (central) state sanctuary. Under the influence of the Canaanite presence in the capital, as well as an explicit toleration of their religion, the Ark soon lost its significance as an anti-Philistine symbol.

Solomon also undertook massive gilding projects by means of conscription among the tribes. Despite the affluence which Solomon created in Israel, we must not assume that at long last there was a sense of genuine solidarity between the tribes. The old hostilities lay just beneath the surface. The Golden Age was brought about at a great price which Solomon was either unaware of or ignored. Tribes which had once known no central authority or political obligation were now subjected to the domination of one man and humiliated by the taxing system of *corvée* labor. A nation of villagers, farmers, and semi-nomads were brought into the cities, thereby disrupting former tribal ties. The Israelites were also subjected to a feudal system of aristocrats and landowners, laborers, and slaves. This only widened the gap between the rich and the poor. Where might the needy and the alien go to find justice in a land in which it was the right and duty of the king to decide what was best for the people?

d. Ethical Conduct in the Time of the Prophets.

Upon Solomon's death, the ferment finally surfaced. Consequently, Solomon's son, Rehoboam, inherited the southern tribes of Judah and Benjamin, while Yahweh raised up Jeroboam to lead the ten northern tribes, since Rehoboam persisted in the oppressive tactics of his father. The Deuteronomist reflects this mood in I Kings 12:16:

"What portion have we in David?
We have no inheritance in the son of Jesse.
To your tents, O Israel!
Look now to your own house, David."

The period of the divided monarchy from the death of Solomon (922 B.C.) to the fall of Jerusalem (587 B.C.) reveals few enlightened monarchs.

In the pre-classical period of prophecy (mid-ninth, mid-eighth centuries), there arose a prophet named Elijah, who in turn passed down his mantle of authority to his disciple Elisha. In the classical period (mid-eighth century onwards) there appeared Amos, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk. The classical prophets, however, were not connected or associated with one another as were the pre-classical prophets. Each of these prophets had his own distinctive message. Yet the prophets did not attempt to convey a message of new content but rather to establish the old one. They were convinced that Yahweh had taught the people how to live righteously but that the Israelites had either abused or ignored Yahweh's teaching. They sought to affirm those basic principles in Israel's historical traditions (i.e., the Law) as inward moral norms. Righteousness essentially came to the forefront during the prophetic period. Often, this period has been characterized as one of excessive moralism. The prophets, however, did not conceive of an ideal, ethical norm which is set up as a standard for human conduct. Instead, they comprehended the will of Yahweh in a deeply personal way. It was not a code

imposed from without, but welled-up from within. Being bound to the will of Yahweh, the prophets set themselves over against any other autocratic authority. As Eichrodt has said:

The ordering of human life by the covenant God now no longer appeals to fear in face of the power of the law-giver, but to a conscience inwardly convinced of the justice of the good. And so in the prophets the question of the whole personal attitude to the will of God is revealed in its moral majesty.⁸

The question was then: 'Who is to interpret the will of Yahweh - priest or prophet?'. This placed the prophet in conflict with the preiast, who represented the cult and served as an extension of the monarchy. The prophets felt obligated to speak out against the atrocities committed by the right against the poor⁹, their perversion of justice in the city gate, and the pollution of Yahwism by foreign cults condoned in the name of diplomacy. The prophets advocated the same standards of behavior for the rich as for the poor. Such equality of behavior was considered commensurate with the order of the world which Yahweh had created.

For the purpose of Israel's election was a personal fellowship between God and people, in which the material goods could never outweigh the value of a free human life. Therefore, Yahweh, as the true shepherd of the flock, himself takes up the cause of his people, who have been deserted by the shepherds set over them, and delivers up to destruction those in their pride despise his will, and abandon justice and equity and practical charity toward the poor and dispossessed among their fellow countrymen, because they regard themselves as the true representatives of the nation.¹⁰

The prophets not only condemned the politics, economics, and social life of their day, but also exercised considerable

⁸Ibid., II, 327.

⁹Amos' condemnation of the rich is seen in verses 2:6-8; 3:9,10; 5:11,12; and 8:4-6.

¹⁰Eichrodt, II, 320.

freedom in expressing their message before the kings of Israel and Judah. The prophets had no authority to speak other than the inner conviction that Yahweh had called them to preach his will. Their words were carried by word of mouth, or sometimes written down. The prophets represented no one class, yet they never achieved wide popularity. When they failed to puncture peoples' attitudes of indifference, the prophets had no choice but to pronounce doom upon the nation. In regard to their ability to prophesy the future, the prophets were not fortune tellers. They perceived the present situation as it really was, then predicted that if radical changes were not made, certain things would happen. They were intimately attuned to the will of God. In the cataclysmic events of 721 and 701 B.D. of Isaiah's time, the people first asked, 'Why has God allowed this to happen?', and then, 'Why is God doing this to us?'. Their vision of the Davidic dynasty and kingdom was irrevocably shattered. By the time Jeremiah appeared (627/'5 B.C.), Judah faced a new set of problems. In Jeremiah's preaching, we see for the first time in Israel's history the consciousness of one's own individuality. This was a significant realization, for now one became personally accountable to Yahweh for one's own actions and decisions. The social structure and the economic order had been seriously disturbed, as well as the political state of affairs. The prophets attempted to raise the consciousness of the leaders, including the king, regarding the implications of their decisions and their

moral responsibility.

e. Individual Responsibility During the Exile and Beyond. Although the division of prophecy between the period preceding the Exile and the Exile itself is admittedly arbitrary, it is not capricious. The Exile remains a major, traumatic event in Israel's (or Judah's) history. We shall, therefore, concentrate on the ramifications of this event through the eyes of Deutero-Isaiah and Ezekiel. In the writings of the former, we know that Judah felt herself to be suffering doubly for her sins. The people could see little salvation in suffering - yet suffering as punishment is man's responsibility, while suffering as redemption or cleansing is God's responsibility. Deutero-Isaiah addressed the people as "you who pursue righteousness, who seek the Lord" (51:1) and "Harken to me, you who know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my Law" (51:7). Yahweh had not forgotten Judah or stopped loving her. Suffering, as a consequence of sin, is temporary and is a form of divine redemption which issues out of love. Deutero-Isaiah gave new meaning to the role of the servant rather than the master.

The most profound expression of righteousness in the Exilic period is to be found in the eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel. No longer would children suffer for the sins of their fathers. The righteous and the wicked shall be saved and condemned respectively on their own merit. An individual must personally decide for or against Yahweh - there are

no shades of gray. Yahweh does not judge men as men do nor does he take pleasure in the deaths of the wicked. Who is or is not righteous is to be decided by Yahweh. An individual cannot justify himself. Emphasis is also placed upon fulfilling the religious and social demands of the law. Yet this is not to be solely with justification by works. This train of thought is further seen in the post-Exilic writings of Trito-Isaiah (58:1-9a).

The Exile in Babylon considerably broadened the Judean's perception of the world, and this directly affected their understanding of the created world. This understanding laid the foundations for a new spiritual life and a new religious community in a foreign land. A significant discovery was made in the fact that Yahweh could be worshiped in a land apart from that promised to Abraham, Moses, and David. The righteous were thus bound together by a new sense of solidarity. Although the people were separated from the cultic environment of the Temple, ten or more men met together to pray and to hear the reading of the Law, as well as to seek the counsel of the prophet.

Out of profound convictions and decisions of individuals a common pattern of conduct is arrived at, having no further connection with the ideal of a national community, but leading to the creation of a congregation of God's people such as had in earlier times formed the living core of the nation, but now with a vocation to develop as and by itself. Here the confrontation of collectivism and individualism is transcended, and the individual ego discovers an encounter with God which is identical with incorporation into a new relationship with his fellow men.¹¹

This spiritual community also became responsible for reflecting upon and revising collections of "laws, historical works,

¹¹Ibid., II, 249-50.

prophetic oracles and books of poetry"¹². The spiritual leaders continued the sermon-style in Deuteronomy, Levitical preaching interspersed with the Chronicles, and Deuteronomic paraenesis of the historical books.

These practices of piety were carried back to Jerusalem and expanded upon by the remnant who returned. Judaism, as the new community of faith, developed its own identity and solidarity in the post-Exilic period. We know from the Psalms written in this later period that the proclamation of righteousness had lost none of its force. A frequent request is for forgiveness on the basis of God's righteousness and mercy. The element of universalism, which for Deutero-Isaiah was integrally related to righteousness, somehow became lost in the development of Judaism. Salvation continued to mean salvation for Jews rather than salvation for the world. Salvation was perceived as a future (eschatological) event. The whole tenor of the times looked towards hope of the final days rather than the memories of the glorious past.

An even more limited application of solidarity with God may be seen in the Qumran community (17 B.C. - A.D. 70). As it may be presumed the Essenes were the inhabitants of the Qumran monastery, we have been able to learn about them through their writings, including one of their leaders - the Teacher of Righteousness. We can observe in this group

¹²Ibid., II, 251.

of men a strong sense of solidarity - both with one another and with Yahweh. The "Manual of Discipline" stipulates the rules for their communal life together. The Habakkuk Peshier, which Dr. William Brownlee has edited, is particularly illustrative of the trials of the Teacher of Righteousness against the Wicked Priest. This community understood itself alone as the true community of faith - therefore preserving the ancient traditions in contrast to the corrupt priests in the Jerusalem Temple. They were the righteous ones who were prepared for the Messiah when he would usher in the new age.

We have followed the development of righteousness as solidarity from its germination in early Israelite tribal life to right conduct as a manifestation of an individual's relationship with Yahweh and his fellow man. Solidarity which originally conveyed the concrete relationships of a tribal community came to represent that which righteousness expressed. This fact reminds us that righteousness never represented an ideal, ethical norm, but rather, the fulfillment of the demands of relationships. Righteousness as solidarity became possible only when it was understood as a holy relationship which transcended all laws and standards. With this understanding, it will now be possible for us to examine certain systematic conclusions about particular relationships in ancient Israel.

2. Systematic Conclustions

a. The Tribal System. We cannot begin to examine the relationships which affected an individual without first considering his/her place in the societal order, as illustrated in Joshua 7:16-18. The individual as a member of a family was also a member of a clan, a tribe, the 'house of Israel', the nation, and finally, a congregation. We shall examine particular factors involved in each of these classifications.

In this patriarchal structure of the Hebrews or later Israelite society (in contrast to fractriarchate or matriarchate societies), an individual was first identified by his father's name (*bēth 'āb*, son of or the house of one's father). Yet in Joshua 7:17, we observe that the family is identified by Achan's grandfather, Zabdi, which would indicate that the grandfather was the head of the household. This would suggest that the children of at least two generations lived within the house, together with slaves, 'sojourners', or resident foreign workers, married/unmarried children, widows, and orphans. H.H. Wolff suggests that it would, therefore, be possible for a household to make up a militia of fifty (I Samuel 8:12). However, such large families would have been limited to a semi-nomadic environment, since Israelite houses would never have contained so many persons. The term for house must be understood flexibly.

The blood-relationship was not the only tie which bound a family together. Marriage, treaties, employment, and other factors entered into the development of a family. Nevertheless, the grandfather, father, or often, a brother, ruled as head of the household. He was expected to make decisions for the family. We must not presume that the head of the household abused his absolute powers, since at the same time he felt a sense of solidarity with his family. He understood himself as the protector of the families' rights. A family was greatly honored if its head was brave, while the family was also punished for the crimes of its leader (II Samuel 21:1). The obligation to protect the weak and oppressed members of the family is best seen in the institution of *go'el* (protection). This meant that the leader was obligated to revenge the blood of one family member by killing the guilty person or a member of his/her family. When one member committed a fatal crime against another, expulsion was substituted for the law of blood revenge. This protected the family against wide-scale retribution and helped maintain a numerical equilibrium within families (or consequently the clan and tribe). Yahweh dictated to Moses that certain cities of refuge were to be established upon entrance into the land (Na. 35:9-34), so that a death could not be avenged until the guilty stood before the congregation for judgement.

When families became too large, such as Abraham's

and Lot's, they split up. However, the feeling of kinship was not lost by this action. When Lot was captured by four raiding kings, Abraham assumed the responsibility of rescuing his brother. Although raiding was understood differently from war, the duty to protect was still applicable.

The final family customs which we shall examine are the laws of 'hospitality' and 'asylum'. Among even semi-nomads the guest is sacrosanct. The stranger has the right to be protected by his host. We can observe Abraham's reception of his three visitors at Mambre (Genesis 18:1-8); Lot's hospitality for the angels whom he insisted sleep under his roof (Genesis 19:1-8); and the invitation from a man of Gibeah for a traveler to sleep in his house rather than the town square (Judges 19:16-34). The stories of Lot and the man of Gibeah illustrate that the laws of hospitality transcended even one's duty to protect the members of one's own household - to the extent of offering one's virgin daughters and concubines to the town's people. The reason for protection is simply because the guest has come under his roof. These traditions also reflect, in a sense, the laws of asylum. When an individual was expelled from a family, he was available to be taken in by another. Those who were not adopted by another family or tribe became the *gerim*, or resident aliens, most frequently found in the cities of refuge. These individuals might or might not be permanent residents. Nevertheless, they were accepted and

were able to receive certain rights. Abraham was a *ger* at Hebron; Moses was one at Midian; and the Israelites were *gerim* in Egypt. As their society became more mobile, that is, moving among villages or cities without the protection of the family, the protection of the resident alien became increasingly important.

The family was related by blood or by territory to others which together formed the clan (*mišpāḥāh*). David, who was of the family of Jesse, was also a member of the clan of Ephrathah, which lived in Bethlehem. The clan met for common religious feasts and sacrificial meals (I Samuel 20:6,9). Each clan was ruled by the heads of its families, called elders (*zēqenim*). Since the word *mišpāḥāh* means 'thousand', we may presume that twenty families (of fifty) comprised a clan. In times of war the clan was lead by a chief (*śar*). Thus, members of families felt a sense of kinship or solidarity under the broader perspective of the clan.

Many things which have been said about the family and clan could be extended to represent the tribe as well. A group of clans (*mišpāḥōt*) made up a tribe (*šēbet*), later *maṭṭeh*. Thus, the clan of Ephrathah belonged with other clans in the southern part of Israel to the tribe of Judah. The Old Testament tells us that the twelve sons of Jacob (Israel) became the ancestors of the twelve tribes of Israel. Whether such blood-relationships were real or contrived made

no difference, since relatives, resident aliens, and adopted children all claimed 'brotherhood' in a wider sense, the tribe could claim a solidarity of its own. When one became attached in 'name and in blood' to the tribe, one acknowledges the tribe as one's own. An individual also agreed to marry and to raise one's family within the tribe. Each tribe was responsible for protecting its own territory, except for the tribe of Levi, which became the priesthood for the tribes. The leader (*nasi*) of the tribe settled the disputes and spoke for the tribe. He represented the largest and most stable form of organization in Israel's early history.

The so-called 'amphictyony' or confederation of tribes was a further attempt under Joshua and the Judges to give the tribes a sense of unity. We have seen that it was not particularly effective. When kingship was introduced under Saul and then David, a more permanent attempt was made to unify the tribes. However, the nation as a permanent confederation of tribes failed, and it was replaced by religious communities or 'congregations'.

Although we have not specifically mentioned the concept of righteousness, it nevertheless remains an undergirding element of the tribal society. One's behavior was important to every member of the community, and from the earliest adoption of Yahwism, this behavior gained religious significance, for there was no greater emphasis, except for

the prophetic period, in respect to one's relationships within a community.

b. Covenant¹³. The concept of covenant in the Old Testament has been a problematical one for Biblical scholars. Consequently, the covenants in Israel's historical traditions have received an inordinate amount of attention. Regardless of its complications, the *sine qua non* sense which demands our attention is that of relationships.

The term *b'rit*, which is translated as 'covenant' in English, is the foundation for Eichrodt's 'God-People' relationship in his Old Testament Theology. However, it is not clear that the covenant should assume such a prominent place in a theology of the Old Testament. Eichrodt mistakenly presumed that we can trace a uniform covenant doctrine throughout Israel's history. Yet a careful analysis of texts reveals a variety of different types of covenants. Those covenants with Noah, Abraham, Moses, Joshua, David, Josiah, and Ezra are all different in form. In fact, the more deeply we probe the texts, the more difficult it becomes to define what we mean by the term 'covenant'. It must be understood that the covenant cannot become a panacea for all of our interpretations.

Wellhausen perceived the early covenant as an expression of primitive religion, while the covenant in the Prophetic period represented the 'morality of a higher religion'. Begriff understood covenant as a 'legal union'.

¹³There is only one example of righteousness (*tsedeq*, Ps. 17:15), yet there are many examples of being righteous (*tsadig*) in relation to the covenant: Gen. 18:19 Ps. 5:12, 7:9; 11:3-5; 31:18; 32:11; 34:16, 20, 22; 37:12, 16, 17, 21, 25, 29, 30, 32, 39; 55:23; 64:11, 69:29; 92:13, 97:11, 12, 125:3.

established by the act of a superior party with an inferior one, while A. Jepsen argues that it is the act rather than the relationship which is significant. L. Köhler has noted that the distinction between *krt b^erît* ('to cut a covenant')-*krt b^erît le/'im* ('to cut a covenant for/with'). The former expresses a covenant between equals, while the latter indicates a covenant in which a superior binds himself to an inferior. This point by Köhler raises several pertinent questions. What are the relationships between participants in the Old Testament? What are the forms of the covenants? Are the covenants indigenous to Israel? We will examine each question separately.

We shall define covenants as being both secular and sacred. Secular covenants were those between individuals. Although Yahweh was not a participant, he was appealed to as a witness. The four types of secular treaties are suzerainty-vassal, parity, patron, and promissory. The suzerainty type binds the inferior party to the superior one, as well as obligating the former to fulfill the stipulations of the latter. In order to gain the support and fidelity of the vassal, the suzerain must give up some of his freedom (I Samuel 11:1). The parity (or peace) covenants indicate equality between the two parties bound by an oath (Genesis 31:44-50; Joshua 9:3-37). There are no texts which give a clear example of patron covenants. In this type, it is understood that the superior party binds him-

self to an obligation for the benefit of the inferior party. Finally, the promissory type guarantees the future compliance with obligations rather than establishing a new relationship. A second classification involves the sacred covenant, that is, a covenant which includes Yahweh. Quite obviously, Yahweh assumed the role of superior, while Israel was the inferior party. Yahweh reminded Israel of his saving acts in the past and invited her to pledge her undivided allegiance to him. If she was obedient to the covenant, she would receive blessings; but if she was disobedient, she would be punished. Thus, in the enduring traditions of the covenant, the demands of the relationship were made clear. Several scholars, in particular G. Mendenhall, have attempted to show through form critical parallels in the Old Testament. The Near Eastern treaty is structured as follows:

- (1) Preamble
- (2) Antecedent History
- (3) Statement of Substance Concerning the Future Relationship
- (4) Specific Stipulations
- (5) Invocations of the Gods as Witnesses
- (6) Curses and Blessings¹⁴

This schema is so consistent that it may be followed, with minor variation, in all treaties. Let us compare this 'secular' treaty with the 'religious' covenant in Joshua 24. This text is selected only as a representative covenant and is not intended to be applicable to all situations.

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|---------------|
| (1) | Preamble | (v.2a) |
| (2) | Antecedent History | (vv.2b-13) |
| (3) | Statement of Substance | (v.14) |
| (4) | Specific Stipulations of God | (vv.25) |
| (5) | Invocations of God | (vv.16,21,24) |
| (6) | Witnesses | (vv.22&27) |
| (7) | Covenant Document | (v.26) |

Joshua 24 follows the preceding schema with the addition of

¹⁴Klaus Baltzer, The Covenant Formulary (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971) p. 10.

the 'Covenant Document'¹⁵ and with the exception of the 'Curses and Blessings'. D.J. McCarthy has suggested that if we combine Joshua 24 with Ex 23:20-33 or Deut. 30 (Mendenhall), we will have the blessing formula in order to complete the treaty. However, even McCarthy has deep reservations about such a reconstruction in order to complete a treaty. While there are elements in Joshua 24 which reflect very ancient traditions, the covenant, as we possess it, is a later redaction. Therefore, we may conclude that it remains dubious whether or not an Old Testament covenant may be paralleled with Near Eastern treaties. Yet because of certain obvious similarities, we may also conclude that the covenant concept was not indigenous to Israel.

J.A. Thomson has said:

It seems clear that the Near Eastern covenant idea provided Israel with a significant metaphor for the exposition of the relationship which existed between Yahweh and herself. Not that the idea as it existed in the secular environment of the day was completely inadequate to expound the many-sided aspects of the divine covenant between Yahweh and His people. But this concept borrowed from the realm of international law, and given special theological application, gave concrete expression to the deeper concept of divine election.¹⁶

The theory of Nötscher that the covenant concept was totally indigenous to Israel appears unfounded.

While it has been comparatively easy to discern what covenant is not, a more difficult task is to define what covenant is. Pedersen has proposed that by analogy with the Arabic word *'and*, *'b^erⁱt* means the "mutual relationship of solidarity, with all the rights and obligations this relationship involves for the parties concerned"¹⁷. Pedersen

¹⁵J.A. Thomson, The Ancient Near Eastern Treaties and the Old Testament (London: Tyndale Press, 1964), p. 22.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 23.

¹⁷Baltzer, p. 3.

criticizes Kraetzschmar of being misled by the European concept of 'treaty' or 'contract', so that *b^erît* becomes the basis for the relationship. I believe that Pedersen correctly identifies *b^erît* as the relationship itself. It is the relationship rather than the form of the agreement which is important. The form instead, assists us in understanding the limitations or the conditions of the relationship. E. Achtemeier noted:

"...we must observe that Israel's relationship to Yahweh was not dependent on her righteousness. Israel's righteousness consisted in the fulfillment of the demands of her relationship with Yahweh, but righteous or unrighteous, she still stood in relationship. The covenant relation was prior to all law and all demands. Yahweh had chosen Israel. That was the basic fact of her existence."¹⁸

The covenant between Israel and Yahweh was one of the factors which set her apart. Israel responded to Yahweh's gracious act by affirming Yahweh as Lord. Köhler has said the covenant with Yahweh "was primarily an attitude and disposition towards Yahweh, a silent recognition of His lordship within the covenant".¹⁹ The covenant at Shechem is presented as superseding those solidarity relationships based on blood ties. It is uncertain to what degree we can agree with Pedersen that a 'new community of life' was being formed. Mowinckel, as well as von Rad and H.J. Kraus, have done a real service in sketching a picture of the role which the covenant played in the cult of Yahwism. Mowinckel has also pointed out the relation of the New Year Festival and the renewal of the covenant. This offered a provision for remembering the provisions of the agreement between Yahweh and His people.

¹⁸Elizabeth Achtemeier, "Righteousness in the Old Testament", in Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, IV, 84.

¹⁹Baltzer, p. 5.

Although we must conclude that it is impossible to subsume all of the interpretations of covenants under one definition, nevertheless the covenants do reflect the significance of relationships. Throughout Israel's history, solidarity with Yahweh and with one another was a means of fulfilling the demands of a covenant.

c. Kingship²⁰. When the cry of the people rose up: "Now appoint for us a king...like all the nations" (I Samuel 8:5,20), the people were calling for a type of ruler which had already been an institution in Egypt and Mesopotamia for more than two millennia. Although those who were in favor of kingship desired a monarch 'like all the nations', Yahweh had a different plan. The Israelite monarch was not meant to become an imitation of the Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Hittite, or any other king.

In Egypt, the Pharaoh was god incarnate and the preserver of world-order. His coronation was a cosmic event. At death, the Pharaoh became one with Osiris - the god of resurrection - which became associated with the mystery of death and resurrection in the cycles of nature. In

²⁰Kingship can be correlated with righteousness in the following passages: I Ki. 3:6; II Sam. 23:3; Ps. 72:1-4; 45:4-7; Prov. 16:10,12,13; 20:28; 25:5; 29:2; Is. 9:6; 11:1-5; 32:1; 59:9, 14; 60:17; Jer. 23:5; Ezek. 45:9; Zech. 9:9.

Mesopotamia, on the other hand, the king was a mortal assigned to serve the gods. His duties involved the maintenance of harmony between nature and society. The king was also responsible for revealing the will of the gods to the people. Although aspects of kingship were conceived differently in these two civilizations, the role of the king as guardian of the relationship between the sustainers of the universe and the people was fundamentally the same.

Israel, however, had defined for herself a distinctive concept of kingship. It is improbable to presume that the people of Israel were unaware of the role of kingship in Egypt and Mesopotamia, in addition to those kings in small neighboring kingdoms. The Israelite monarch was secular to the degree that he was also non-mythological.

The Book of Judges reveals that at first there was considerable opposition to kingship: "In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes." (Judges 17:6; 18:1; 19:1; 21:25) Gideon was determined that Yahweh alone would rule over them. When the people rejected Yahweh as king, it was Yahweh who transferred his kingship to the person whom he chose. Thus, Saul became the first representative of Yahweh.

When the king was chosen, he was anointed with oil as a sign of his divine election. Although anointing with oil as a common custom in the ancient Near East as an act of confirming kingship, this in no way detracted from its signi-

ficance. This act was generally performed in a sanctuary or holy place and was the responsibility of the priesthood. The king was given the *nezzer* (crown or diadem) and '*eduth* (testimony or solemn law) by the priest. In addition to the religious symbolism of this rite, the enthronement of a king had cosmological significance. Yahweh was establishing a new representative on earth whom he would empower with his spirit to rule with justice and righteousness.

The king was first recognized as a *nagid*, that is, an administrator of Yahweh's affairs. This investiture of authority was not permanent at first, Yahweh very quickly regretted having chosen Saul as king: "I repent that I have made Saul as king; for he has turned back from following me, and has not performed my commandments." (I Samuel 15:11a) It has been suggested by de Vaux that the king of Israel was a vassal of Yahweh, which was a common practice among mortal kings throughout the ancient Near East - 'like all the nations'. Although it is uncertain that a Suzerain-Vassal treaty was envisaged, yet in principle the king could count on Yahweh's protection as long as he remained faithful to him.

Yahweh raised his relationship with the king of Israel to a higher plane by his gift of an eternal covenant to David - a sign of eternal solidarity. This has been attributed as much to David's own character as to Yahweh's divine grace. The covenant, as has been previously exam-

ined, was an expression of divine choice and the conferment of servant status upon the king. Yahweh established an unconditional covenant with David, as his *melek*, and he will sustain his dynasty as long as his successors remain faithful to the relationship of Yahweh and king. Because Rehoboam had acted unrighteously in continuing the oppressive customs of his Father (Solomon), ten of the twelve tribes were taken away from him. This left Jeroboam with one to represent David and one to represent Jerusalem (I Kings 11:32).

The king was not given free reign to administer the people and the land as he pleased. Yahweh was gratified when Solomon asked for the understanding to discern right and wrong. A king was expected to act with wisdom commensurate with his responsibilities. Rehoboam, as a new king, asked the elders how they thought he should answer the people.

And they said to him, 'If you will be a servant to this people today and serve them, and speak good words to them when you answer them, then they will be your servants forever'. (I Kings 12:7)

Once the king had been enthroned, his trials began. For anointment offers no protection against wrongdoing, unless he fulfills the demands of the relationship with Yahweh. This is perhaps best expressed in one of the coronation prayers:

"Give the king thy justice, O God,
 and thy righteousness to the royal son!
 May he judge the people with righteousness
 and thy poor with justice!
 Let they mountains bear prosperity for the people,
 and the hills, in righteousness!
 May he defend the cause of the poor of the people,
 give deliverance to the needy,
 and crush the oppressor!" (Psalm 72:1-4)

As king, he is expected to judge with equity not only the wealthy and the powerful, but also the widow, the orphan, the destitute, and the resident alien. As the tribes had declined in importance with respect to their ability to protect the individual, the king was called upon to assume the responsibility of protecting the individual. The Psalms, Proverbs, and Prophetic speeches offer frequent instruction regarding the expected behavior of the king.

"Better is a little righteousness
 than great revenues with injustice.
 It is an abomination to do evil
 for the throne is established by righteousness.
 Righteous lips are the delight of the king
 and he loves him who speaks what is right."
 (Prov. 16:10,12,13)

In quite a different interpretation of Jer. 23:5a, Sweetnam has attempted to prove that *ts^edaqaḥ* means legitimate (i.e., heir) rather than righteous. I believe Sweetnam is correct in many of the Near Eastern parallels which he has chosen, but I do not believe that legitimacy would be a suitable meaning for all contexts, as he seems to imply. Yahweh is the one who legitimates the king.

A consequence of righteous behavior before Yahweh is a relationship with the people. The solidarity of the king with the people is affirmed in a (difficult) text:

²¹James Sweetnam, "Some Observations on the Background of 7"TY in Jeremias 23,5a," Biblica XLVI(1965),29-40.

And Jehoiadah (the priest) made a covenant between the Lord and the king (Jehoash) and the people, that they should be the Lord's people; and also between the king and the people. (II Kings 11:17)

It was to the king's advantage in time of unrest to have the peoples' support and to be known for integrity and justice. This was most important when the dynastic principle or faithfulness to Yahweh was being threatened. The discovery of the book of the covenant in the Temple signaled a moment of renewal in the relationship of Yahweh and His people.

And the king stood by the pillar and made a covenant before the Lord, to walk after the Lord and to keep his commandments and his testimonies and statutes, with all his heart and all his soul, to perform the words of this covenant that were written in this book; and all the people joined in the covenant. (II Kings 23:3)

Except for a few enlightening moments in the history of Israel's monarchy, it would be difficult to qualify kingship as a success. Yet the tradition of enthronement Psalms preserved the possibility to renewing a reign established upon righteousness with Yahweh and the people.

d. Law²². The place of the Law in the Old Testament is not insignificant. On the other hand, the Law should not be understood by the Biblical reader as synonymous with the Old Testament (i.e., the Law and Gospel). If the Law is placed in its proper perspective, with assistance of form-critical and traditio-historical criticism, it will contribute significantly to our understanding of right behavior in ancient Israel. We shall attempt to define the

²²Righteousness can be correlated with law in the following passages: Lev. 19:15; Deut. 1:16; 6:25; 16:18,20 (twice); II Sam. 8:15; 22:21,25; I Ki. 10:9; I Chron. 18:14; II Chron. 9:8; Ps. 58:2; 72:1-3; Prov. 8:15,20; 31:9; Ecc. 5:7; Is. 5:7; 11:4,5; 16:5; 51:7; 59:4; Jer. 22:3,15; Hos. 14:10; Am. 5:7,24; Ezek. 18:19,21.

term before examining its development during three periods of Israel's history: the Law in pre-Mosaic times, the Law in the period from Moses to the Exile, and the Exile itself and beyond.

The term 'Torah' in Hebrew is generally translated as 'law'. The proper noun Law refers to the Pentateuch, or the first five books of the Old Testament. Although the meaning of Torah is 'instruction' or 'guidance', this term is often replaced by other words: 'commandment' (Gen. 26:5), 'word' (Ex 34:28), 'decree' (Amos 2:4), and 'judgement' (Ex 21:1), among others. The norm precedes the establishment of Law. It would be difficult to imagine a society without laws. The collection or codification of laws is to be understood at a later stage. Now let us attempt to unravel the skein of traditions which comprised Israel's understanding of law.

We may presuppose that in the third millennium it was necessary to make legal decisions regarding economic, social, and political situations. However, at the turn of the millennium, a major achievement was made when these legal situations were collected in a single code. In a type called 'causistic' law, particularly the Code of Hammurabi, there was an attempt to standardize legislation on the most common situations. The form of this case law is easily identifiable: 'If a man...', then he shall...' As Mesopotamian society became more complex, we may presume that these

282 laws (of the Hammurabi Code) became less than adequate and required occasional changes or additions.

Archeology has further shown that many of the legal and social customs in the Book of Genesis reflect middle second millenium traditions from the ancient Near East. A man had the right to adopt a slave for an heir, if his wife did not bear him a son (Genesis 15:1-4; 24:1-2). The adopted son had certain rights, even if the man's wife did subsequently bear him a son²³. The wife was also forbidden from sending away the adopted son (Genesis 16:1-6). Blood revenge, marriage, and guest hospitality, which were previously discussed under the Clans, also were related to the judicial process. Many of these laws, which were probably uncodified, represent the cross-fertilization of legal traditions about which the Hebrews were undoubtedly aware.

The traditions accorded to Moses and the Hebrews at Sinai reflect a remarkable, though not unique, departure from the past. The redaction of what von Rad calls the "Sinai pericope of JE (Ex 19-34, 32-34), and that of P (Ex 25-31, 34-Num. 10:10)" comprises the revelation of legal traditions by Yahweh to the Hebrews. The experience at Sinai represented the transformation of regulations covering secular life into the

"...proclamation (in the Decalogue) of a divine sovereign right over every sphere of human life. On

²³James Pritchard (ed.) The Ancient Near East Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958) pp. 168-69.

the other hand, the content of the Priestly Document is the revelation of a sacral order: it orders the life of the cult, and along with it the whole intricate system of sacrifices and rites, by means of which Israel was to effect communion with God."²⁴

The Decalogue (Ex 20:2-17) remembers the situation of the Hebrews in the Sinai following the Exodus. Although the latter represents a separate tradition, nevertheless, the simple yet profound imperatives and prohibitions suggest a rejection of any infringement on their autonomy. The apodictic prohibition - "Thou shalt not" - is limited to those actions which are not permitted, while leaving all other alternatives open. An imperative, on the other hand, is very limited. Yahweh established as normative only those areas which would adversely affect the covenant relationship. Although Yahweh addressed the 'individual' in the second person, the individual is an integral part of the whole community - including his (Hebrew) neighbors.

The Covenant Code (Ex 20:22-23:33) is a collection of mixed types of laws which may be dated to the end of the Twelfth Century. Categorical imperatives state that "Whoever...shall be..." (Ex 21:12, 15-17; 22:19). Although the Covenant Code bears certain resemblances to the Hammurabi Code, it is evident throughout that the Israelites' relationship with Yahweh has affected the formulations of

²⁴Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), I, 190.

theory has been modified, it has generally been upheld. The traditio-historical question of the origin and age of the Priestly Document is left unanswered. We may thus see that much of the cultic legal material contained in the Priestly Document was perhaps unknown to the earlier Prophets. Before considering the Priestly material, we should not overlook the Deuteronomic legislation.

The discovery of the Book of the Law in the Temple (622/21) by Josiah precipitated a short-lived reform. The 'Book' was in fact a law collection contained in Chapters 12-26 in the Deuteronomists redaction. Chapter 5 contains a second version of the Decalogue, and Chapter 27 is a curse ritual.²⁵ This remarkable book, which is purported to be the speech of Moses, is, in fact, a series of sermonic discourses which are intended for teaching. The remarkably humanitarian attitude of the book is taken in order to preserve the covenant and relationship with Yahweh. Solidarity with the land, the widow, the orphan, and the oppressed are once again affirmed.

The Priestly Document, which contains material in portions of each book of the Pentateuch, was written in the Exilic and post-Exilic periods. The most significant collection dating from this period is the Holiness Code con-

²⁵Josef Scharbert has systematically analyzed 'solidarity-thinking' in the ancient Near East, as well as the specific tradition of blessing and curse which exemplified the relationship of father and son.

in Lev. 16-26. These laws are primarily concerned with the purity and holiness of the Israelites, since they are still to be a people set apart from other nations. Thus Israel concluded her history with priestly interpretations of the law.

We have seen that at the initiation of Yahweh's saving relationship with the people of Israel old social and legal customs are transformed. These laws were never allowed to remain static, but instead, were subjected to continual re-interpretation. As von Rad has said:

For Israel this law was far from being a known quantity which only needed to be called to mind - it was something learned from experience. When Israel heard the commandments read aloud in early times at the pilgrimage festivals - she came face to face with her God.²⁶

For, through obedience to the law, the will of Yahweh was actualized:

e. Wisdom²⁷; Creation. Wisdom in the Old Testament presents us with a different type of instruction than that of the Torah. Wisdom, as expressed in proverbs, parables, and other didactic forms, has been shown to have a "*Gattung*", that is, literary form or genre, all its own.²⁸ It will be necessary to define Wisdom before proceeding to examples of the Wisdom literature.

²⁶von Rad, I, 394.

²⁷Righteousness may be correlated with wisdom in the following passages: Prov. 1:3; 2:9; 8:20; 10:2; 11:4-6, 18, 19; 12:28; 13:6; 14:34; 15:9; 16:8, 12; 20:28; 21:3, 21; 23:5; Ecc. 3:16; 7:15; Is. 11:1-5.

²⁸J. William Whedbee, Isaiah & Wisdom (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971) p. 23. Whedbee believes that the English translations of this German word do not express its oral as well as its literary dimensions.

Wisdom is the verbal expression of the very essence of the created world-order. Israel's Wisdom is founded upon the basic element of experience. This practical knowledge of the world permeated every aspect of life. Wisdom was formulated in short, insightful maxims. The effect was to create a form of order out of chaos. Through paradoxes, the reality of the created world order is understood. If we savor the words of these maxims, i.e., "that the bread of deceit tastes sweet, but the mouth is afterwards filled with gravel" (Prov. 23:17), we cannot but be impressed with the depth of reality which is expressed. Von Rad has said:

Empirical and gnostic wisdom starts from the unyielding presupposition that there is a hidden order in things - only, it has to be discerned in them, with great patience and at the cost of all kinds of painful experience. And this order is kindly and righteous.²⁹

This Wisdom is not understood as systematic, that is, philosophical and theological. By comparison, Wisdom was able to reveal profound truths about man and nature:

Clouds and winds and yet no rain, So is man who boasts of gifts and never gives. (Prov. 25:14)

Von Rad further notes that

When life can be set alongside like, there is already great pain, for these phenomena now lose the absolutely puzzling quality they had in isolation.³⁰

Although Wisdom traditions were prevalent throughout the Ancient Near East - the Egyptian proverbs of Amemope were reproduced in Prov. 22:17-24:22 - Israel placed

²⁹von Rad, I, 421.

³⁰von Rad, I, 425.

her own indelible imprint upon her Wisdom literature. Solomon was recognized as the man of wisdom, par excellence. However, many Proverbs and maxims which were attributed to him were in fact the creation and compilation of a later Wisdom school. The man of wisdom was a perceptive observer, not a moralist with the fire of a prophet. There was no attempt to aggrandize proper conduct, but rather, he attempted to simply state the consequences of righteous behavior, which was in accord with the world-order. The way of righteousness is life, while the path of wickedness leads to death.

In the later development of Wisdom, the literature reflected a 'theological' perception of reality. Wisdom was personified or personalized in the feminine form:

"Wisdom has built her house,
 she has set up her seven pillars.
 She has slaughtered her beasts,
 she has mixed her wine,
 she has also set her table.
 She has sent out her maids to call
 from the highest places in the town,
 'Whoever is simple, let him turn in here!'
 To him who is without senses she says,
 'Come, eat of my bread
 and drink of the wine I have mixed.
 Leave simpleness, and live
 and walk in the way of insight'." (Prov. 9:1-6)

How are we to bridge the gap between the 'practical' Wisdom previously mentioned and 'theological' Wisdom? The former type is contained in Proverbs 10-29, while the latter is represented in Proverbs 1-9. We need to further qualify these terms. Von Rad has said regarding practical Wisdom:

A man who organizes his life properly and who takes his place in a helpful way within the community, who does justice to the claims of others (and of course, also to those of God), this man wisdom call righteous.³¹

On the other hand, he states:

What this wisdom teaching has to say only passes over into theology where the subject-matter contains some kind of pointer or reference to Yahweh, his activity, or what pleases or displeases him.³²

J.A. Ziesler has attempted to bridge this gap between 'practical' and 'theological' Wisdom by stating that "wisdom is both something man practices and something God is...."³³

Righteousness, which is also a gift of Yahweh, is that which man practices and which God is.

Wisdom is now understood as the divine call to men, and therefore, as the mediator of revelation: it is the great teacher of all nations in general and of Israel in particular. Indeed, it is understood as the divine principle bestowed upon the world at Creation.³⁴

In the Wisdom literature, as reflected in Job 38, we see that interest became focused upon the relation of creation and the saving will of Yahweh for Israel. The theological understanding of Wisdom became far removed for 'practical' maxims of Solomon and was fused with a new horizon.

The concept of Creation dating to this (Exilic) period merits further consideration. The Yahwist account in Gen. 2:4b-25 focuses upon the creation of man and woman,

³¹Ibid, p. 436.

³²Ibid, p. 437.

³³J.A. Ziesler, The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), p. 46.

while the Priestly Document (Gen. 1:1-2:4a) concentrates on the creations of the world. Not until this period was Yahweh understood as the Creator of the world. It is important to see that while the Wisdom school looked at the world as Creation and sought a connection with Yahweh's saving history, the Priestly school began with Creation in order to perceive the saving history of Yahweh. The primal history was the initiation of Yahweh's saving relationship with the people of Israel.

Yahweh created the world, and at the pinnacle of his creation he placed man. Man was brought into existence not by the 'spoken' word, but rather through an 'act' of creation. In the Yahwist version, man and woman are in the midst of the picture rather than the pinnacle. Other differences abound, including the Priestly writer's interest in cosmology. However, the emphasis which here needs to be made is the special relationship with Yahweh.

It is obvious in the phrase, "Let us make man in our own image...", that man was being accorded a very special place in creation. It is important to see that man, as a creature of Yahweh, owes his existence and its meaning to Yahweh. Man is blessed by the gift of dominion over animals and organic life. Man and beast have been given the gift of fertility. This blessing binds man and beast together. As previously quoted in the Introduction (p. 2) regarding *ts^edaqah*: 'It is the standard not only for man's relationship to God, but also for his relationship to the animals

and to his natural environment'. The formulation of world-order in Gen. 1 gives man dominion over animals and organic life but by implication, not over men. He must also act righteously in order to maintain solidarity with his fellow man.

There are other references to Creation - Second Isaiah, Psalms 8, 22, 82, 104, Job 38 in the Old Testament - which contribute to our knowledge of the concept. The story of Jonah illustrates that the Creator not only had dominion over the nations of the earth, but also compassion. Second Isaiah perceives Yahweh as Creator and Redeemer. The eschatological and apocalyptic writings of the Exilic and post-Exilic point toward the subjugation of the nations, Yahweh's enthronement and dominion over the world, his recognition as Israel's God, and Israel's role as a light to the nations. The people looked forward with expectation to the new covenant, the new creation, and the restoration of the Davidic dynasty by the Messiah. Yahweh is about to make all things new.

We have followed the transformation of Israel from its germination in a tribal society to religious communities. We have observed not only that righteousness was the foundation of the Law and justice, but also that the clan and the covenant became the foundation of kingship. We may attribute the lateness of Israel's conception of Creation to her ability to finally correlate the traditions of Yahweh's sav-

ing acts in history with a theological understanding of universal history. Although righteousness, like Wisdom, only gradually gained theological significance, it never ceased to represent the fundamental yet profound relationships of solidarity with Yahweh and one's fellow man.

B. RIGHTEOUSNESS AS SOLIDARITY IN THE TEACHING OF PAUL

1. The Old Testament

a. The Israelite Tradition³⁵. In the first century of the Christian era, Judaism in Palestine was split into four principal parties - the Pharisees, Saducees, Zealots, and Essenes. Among these factions arose another movement which was led by Jesus of Nazareth which after Pentecost may be termed the 'early church'. The Jews did not appreciate the presence of another Jewish party in their midst, and they considered Jesus and his followers a serious rival. Although the growing Christian community was rejected by the Jews, the early Christians nevertheless attempted to mollify their differences with the Jews.

The early church was confronted with a barrage of problems in its formative years, yet none may be perceived so significant as the establishment of its own identity as individuals and as a community. The 'founding fathers' of the early church, that is, Jews, the disciples, and first followers, were not only Jews but also thoroughly Jewish in

³⁵Christian Müller, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964). I am here following the terminology of Müller.

their thinking. The new movement which they began drew heavily upon their rich heritage. The continuum which existed between the religion and culture of ancient Israel and the Hellenistic world of New Testament times manifested itself in the Septuagint. Although that sacred record of the past had 'smoothed over' many of the distinctive and problematical traditions of the past, the Septuagint nevertheless remained authoritative for the writers of the New Testament. The frequency with which the phrase 'it is written' is employed before quoting a passage of Scripture reflects the esteem in which the Old Testament was held. Although the Eastern Mediterranean was politically controlled by Rome, Greek continued to exert tremendous (Hellenistic) influence as the *lingua franca* of the Gentile and Jewish communities.

Into this somewhat unified picture we need to understand the place of Saul of Tarsus. This man of exemplary zeal who studied under the learned Gamaliel was a Pharisaic Jew of extraordinary ability. A conversion experience transformed Saul (Paul) from a persecuter of Christianity to a converter of the Jews and heathens. Since Tarsus in Asia Minor was his home, it was natural that his kerygmatic mission led him to the Hellenistic and Roman world beyond the boundaries of Palestine. He sought to proselytize the Gentiles, that is, non-Jewish populations as well as the Jews. While Peter, James, and the other disciplines moved

among the Palestinean churches, Paul, Timothy, and Barnabas travelled eastward. The Jerusalem Council was planned for 49 A.D. in order to work out problems which had arisen during the two-fold mission. Paul spent three months in Corinth on his way to Jerusalem at which time he wrote his epistle to the community of Christian believers in Rome. Paul Minear has perceptively analyzed the Roman (Christian) community as representing "The Eternal Triangle". Within this community he recognized: "The 'weak in faith' who condemned the 'strong in faith'; the strong in faith who scorned and despised the weak in faith; and the doubters (Cf. Rom. 14:1-16:27)"³⁶. The 'labels' reflect Roman prejudice by one faction against another. The first were those converted Jews and Gentiles who accepted the yoke of the Law, the dietary laws, festivals, the sacredness of the Sabbath, and kinship with Abraham and Moses. The second group who were strong in faith despised those who needed dietary laws, circumcision, and kinship to 'prop up' their faith. The strong discarded inhibitions about the Sabbath and festival days and declared that every day was holy. Paul identified himself with the strong in faith when he said: "We who are strong ought to bear with the failings of the weak, and not to please ourselves...." (Romans 15:1) The third group was the doubters. It was from this group that the weak and the strong tried to woo doubters to their

³⁶Paul Minear, The Obedience of Faith (Naperville: Allenson, 1971), pp. 8-13.

side. The doubters were more fearful of intimidation and condemnation by the two factions than of Christ's judgement. They fluctuated from one side to another or slipped back into Judaism. Into this community of tenuous relationships, Paul felt called to share his message. The strong were urged not to despise the weak nor were the weak to scorn the strong.

Paul travelled to Jerusalem and reassured the Palestinian church of his position. Paul, in effect, won his case against Peter regarding the Jewish rite of circumcision. Paul argued that it was not necessary for a Gentile to become a Jew before becoming a Christian. Those who were already Jews were that much better informed about the Israelite traditions which helped to mold the Christian faith. Many of the Christians to whom Paul was writing at Rome were former Jews. This implies that they would have had a different appreciation from that of pagan converts. Paul felt a tremendous bond of solidarity with his kinsmen, that is, the Jews. Yet Paul

"...confirms that Israel enjoys a historical pre-eminence, as the promise was entrusted to it. But this pre-eminence is historical and relative, not eschatological and absolute. The Jew is equal to the Gentile in the judgement, because God judges by works alone and even the Jew receives righteousness only by faith."³⁷

The early Christians had to come to terms with the fact that

³⁷Hans Conzelmann, An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 249.

God intended to impute his righteousness to Gentile as well as Jew. We have seen that this was a very practical problem which effected the solidarity of the Christian community in Rome. The abrogation of the Mosaic Law caused tensions not only with their Jewish brethren, but also within the community itself. These decisions reflect the problematical transition of a movement which accepts some elements yet rejects others. Many individuals assumed that if there could be compromises on these matters, Christians could share the synagogues with Jews. This, however, would imply that Christianity was only a sect of Judaism. Paul envisioned Christianity's mission as being far broader. Although the picture presented here is only implied by Paul's letter, we can be fairly certain that relationships between Christians of various backgrounds and other Christians or Jews were often severely strained. This situation involved significant issues which had to be resolved.

b. Foundations of a Universal History. The self-understanding of the early church was built upon the premise that God sacrificed his son on the cross for the sins of the whole world. The assumption that Jesus of Nazareth was also the Messiah was a major obstacle for the Jews. In Chapters 9-11 of Romans speak to the issue of the Israelite tradition but point beyond it as well. Paul gently commends the Jews for their zeal, but he says that "it is unenlightened". (Romans 10:2) He prays that they too will be saved. The

Jews have missed the mark by striving after their own righteousness based on works rather than accepting the righteousness of God as a gift based on faith. The essence of the problem was the acceptance of righteousness imputed by Christ rather than kinship with Abraham and Moses. Paul was implying that when God caused the Jews 'to stumble', God was not rejecting their divine election. God upheld his promise that a remnant would survive, but he also chose to admit Gentiles to the election as well. God's covenant with Abraham had been tested and enforced.

Within the new community of faith, we can see everywhere echoes of former traditions: the rites of purification in baptism, the Passover meal in the Lord's supper, the old covenant in the new, the synagogue in the early church, as well as numerous other possibilities. The earliest Christian communities are unmistakably founded upon Jewish traditions which found new expression in Christianity.³⁸ Jerusalem was no longer considered to have a pre-eminent role in the salvation of the world. Although the themes of nationalism/internationalism versus universalism of Judaism and

³⁸C. Müller and P. Stuhlmacher have perceived the origins of Paul's understanding of the 'righteousness of God' to be within Judaism. They interpret this expression as a Jewish technical term which reveals God's faithfulness to their covenant. Both authors have understood the righteousness of God in a forensic sense. The expression has been absolutized by Stuhlmacher and linked with predestination by Müller (reflecting Israel's election). They also provide a historical survey of interpretations of the expression, although the former does so far more thoroughly.

Christianity respectively was an attempt by Christianity to assert its superiority, Christian communities have seldom been able to reflect true universalism. Judaism had become an international community spread throughout the diaspora, yet it waited with expectation for the restoration of the Israelite kingdom. The church, which in the "Israel of God", affirmed its solidarity in the confession that Jesus Christ is Lord. As Paul said in Gal. 3:23-28:

Now before faith came, we were confined under the law, kept under restraint until faith should be revealed. So that the law was our custodian until Christ came, that we might be justified by faith. But, not that faith has come, we are no longer under a custodian; for in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith. For as many of you as were baptised into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither is there slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

This momentum towards universality did attempt to establish new images - free from national distinctions, the social order, religious traditions - as well as the primal images which God affected with creation of the world. This lack of distinction integrally related to both universality and God's salvation offered to mankind. Since Paul equates salvation and righteousness, a closer examination of the righteous individual in a Christian community merits further attention.

2. Righteousness as a Relational Realm of Reality in the Church

The primary understanding of righteousness in the early church was forensic rather than relational. The func-

tion of righteousness was two-fold - to maintain solidarity with God and with other men. A secondary function was the meeting of the demands of those relationships. The church, as the visible assembly of Christians, had the responsibility of nurturing those relationships. We must also understand that the church perceived itself as an eschatological community. The parousia was expected within one generation. Living in the last time of the world necessarily set the tempo for what may be termed the "Pauline ethic". This is reflected in the pre-eminent place of righteousness as an integral part of the closing act of a salvation history. In Jewish piety, righteousness had become a forensic eschatological term denoting preparation for the future verdict of God. Paul, on the other hand, asserts that the righteousness which has already been imputed to the Gentiles is a present reality, as well as retaining its forensic eschatological meaning. Bultmann explains this paradox by saying:

God already pronounces His eschatological verdict (over the man of faith) in the present; the eschatological event is already present reality, or rather, is beginning in the present. Therefore, the righteousness which God adjudicates to man (the man of faith) is not 'sinlessness' in the sense that God does not count man's sins against him (II Cor. 5:19).³⁹

Solidarity with God clearly cannot be understood as an ethical norm.

The story of Cornelius (Acts 10:22) reveals that he is righteous because he fears God. In a parable, Jesus

³⁹Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955) p. 276.

called a judge unrighteous because he neither feared God nor man in his position of responsibility (Luke 18:2-8). A pre-supposition of righteousness is a proper attitude of fear and trust in God. This relationship reflects a positive dependence upon God. Jesus' baptism was also an act that "fulfills all righteousness" because it is in accord with the call for a covenant relationship with God.

Righteousness as a relationship between men expressed more than a quality of life. The parable of the unfaithful steward (Luke 16:1) illustrated the breaking of a trust relationship between a servant and his master. A relationship of trust and compassion between individuals reflected not only a social dimension but also a theological dimension as well. When Paul felt righteous about his relationship with the Philippians, he was also expressing solidarity with God.

Solidarity with God and men requires the fulfillment of the demands of the relationship. Whether or not a formal covenant is understood to be in effect, trust in God and obedience to his will are prerequisites for fulfilling the demands of the relationship. Although the demands are understood to change, the prerequisites will not be altered. However, since none has been able to meet the demands of the relationship and therefore all have broken the covenant, it is only by the grace of God and through faith in Christ that man can be righteous.

3. Individual and Corporate Responsibility as Christians

Within the term 'Christians' is presupposed the fact that we are members of the 'body of Christ'. J.A. Ziesler has drawn attention to this concept.

To be in Christ is to be in the new Adam, in a solidarity of life, and of righteousness, as against being in 'natural' humanity, the old Adam, in a solidarity of sin and death, cf. Rom. 5:12-21; I Cor. 15:22. To be in Christ is therefore both personal, because it requires personal faith and relation to Christ, and also corporate,⁴⁰ because there is a new unity of mankind in him.

This is a basic statement which implies that not only have responsibility for our own solidarity with Christ but also solidarity with all our individuals throughout the world. We as individuals are corporately in Christ, and the corporate Christ is in each part of his corporate personality. Consciousness of this relationship within Christian believers (creates) responsibilities, as well as the blessings of righteousness and justification by faith. H. Richard Niebuhr has noted in his work, The Responsible Self, that 'responsibility' is a relatively new word, yet he also states that the concept itself is an ancient one. Responsibility is as much a part of original creation as it is of the New Creation. Righteousness affirms the solidarity of our humanity through God's creation of world-order.

We have folled the transformation of righteousness as solidarity from the founding of Israel's tribal society

⁴⁰ Ziesler, p. 165.

to exchatological community of faith. Although the individual only gradually became aware that he or she was a unique human being, the individual never lost touch with his sense of connectedness - to God and to other individuals. The kinship among members of the tribe has been replaced in Christian communities down through the centuries of the Christian era (to the present) as the solidarity of a denomination or congregation. The preaching of Paul to the Gentiles now leads us to examine the same honored task in the Twentieth Century.

Chapter III

THE HOMILETICAL ADVENTURE

A. TRANSLATING THE PAST INTO SERMONIC FORM

We have witnessed in the previous chapter the diverse interpretations of righteousness as solidarity from the beginnings of Israel's history to the founding of the early church. These interpretations are the result of significant socio-historical changes which took place. In the Twentieth Century, we have also experienced vast changes in our own socio-historical situation. We no longer speak in terms of tribal systems, covenants, kingship, the Law, wisdom, and creation. This essentially reflects a problem in translation from one culture/language to another. Yet it is to be perceived that new developments in language are antecedent to changes in a socio-historical situation. How then shall we translate the past into the present and the present into the past? And what value has the Biblical tradition of righteousness as solidarity for us, as individuals and corporate members of modern Christian communities?

The value of the Biblical tradition can best emerge through dialogue. Within the framework of preaching, dialogue has an important role. If we perceive that 'that which is old is irrelevant', we would be disinclined to confront the Scriptures for answers. If, on the other hand, a

text representing a different socio-historical situation is permitted to challenge our morality or depth of commitment, tension will arise. Through dialogical preaching, the present is able to address the past, as well as the past informing the present. Dialogue can assist in alleviating tension between the past and the present. Only when we allow the individual in Biblical society to speak his/her word of meaning to us, will we in turn address our personal and societal concerns to him. This dialogue initiates the process of translation. This process supports the premise that God's word never loses its relevancy.

The value of dialogical preaching is to be seen not only within encounters between the past and the present, but also between the preacher and his/her congregation, members of the congregation with one another, and all with God. The 're-presentation' of praxis or interrelationships in preaching is the first step towards establishing righteousness as solidarity within our own Christian community. Interrelationships with God and with our fellow man is the foundation of an effective preaching ministry. The value and urgency of this ministry should not obscure the fact that preaching is also an adventure. Thus, when the exegetical task is completed, the homiletical adventure begins.

The preaching event is a manifestation of interaction between the past and the present and between the pastor and his/her community. This dialogical event is the real

testing ground of ideas. Therefore, three sermons have been incorporated into this Project, in order to illustrate the contemporary value of righteousness as solidarity to a Christian community. The first sermon, "Dante's Garden", is structured upon Psalm 33:1-9. The second sermon, "A Royal Partnership", is developed in light of Jeremiah 23:5,6 and Proverbs 16:12,13. The third and final sermon, "Christian Solidarity", is built upon the texts of Isaiah 58:1-9a and Romans 14:1-15:6. These sermons represent an attempt to translate the Biblical concepts of creation, kingship, and the Law which have been previously examined as they relate to the significance of righteousness as solidarity for our own socio-historical situation.

Sermon 1: Dante's Garden

I would ask you to think with me this morning about God's activity in creation and history and our response in worship. This enormous subject is partially portrayed in the verses of Psalm 33 which we have heard read this morning. Although the Psalm begins with praise, moves through God's sustenance of the world and mankind, and concludes with his creation of the world, we shall reverse the order - beginning with God's act and concluding with our response. This Psalm also has an underlying theme - solidarity. Although solidarity normally conveys 'oneness', 'togetherness', or 'fellowship', we shall understand solidarity as relationships with far deeper meanings. God has manifested his relatedness to

the world through his initial act of creation, as well as the sustenance of his world. We also may proclaim our solidarity with God through our worship of him.

Questions about God's creation and its meaning have become more frequent for those of us who have been climbing to the top of Mt. Hollywood on these Saturday mornings in Lent. Along the east trail, near the top, there can be found a lush garden with tall, shady trees. This oasis is now known as Dante's Garden. In the quiet beauty of that natural sanctuary, we have our devotions together. It is a time when we once again become sensitized to God's creation. In the busyness, the starkness, and the impermanency of city life, it is so easy to loose touch with that which is eternal and significant. Yet, I believe that in the microcosm of Dante's Garden, we have a clue to the understanding of God's creation.

Let us first look at God's act of creation. In the beginning, God created the heavens, the earth, the fish of the sea, the birds of the air, and every living thing in order to express solidarity with his creation. This solidarity expresses a loving concern for the establishment of world order. All that he has created, with the exception of ourselves, works in harmony - the moon and the tides, the fruitful changing of the seasons, the ecological balance of the animal and organic life, the activity of day followed by the restfulness of night. God's self revelation in nature

I believe to be a reality distinct from him, yet one which would not exist without him. Even if modern scientists were able to explain every facet of creation and its meaning, we would still not fully know God. We know more about the world than the authors of Genesis 1 and Psalm 33, yet the world is little less incomprehensible to us, because windows have opened new mysteries of God's universe.

The Psalmist tells us that the Lord created the heavens by his word and "all their host by the breath of his mouth". As in Genesis 1, it is written that God spoke, and it happened. In the latter phrase we should understand the 'host' and the 'breath of his mouth' as the sun, moon, and the stars of the heavens which were also created by the word. And by these actions we know that wind and weather patterns were set in motion which have continued to shape the face of this earth. In imagery as only the Old Testament authors can express it, the heavens store "the waters of the sea", as in a "bottle" or pitcher, which are to be poured out upon the earth. The "deeps" beneath the earth and in the seas keep the waters as in storehouses. If you have a scientific interest in the natural world, you might be inclined to describe it in the terms of your own vocabulary. But in the eyes of the Psalmist, there is captured the fear and awe of the Lord who is able to bring such a universe into being by the power of the word.

Arguments have raged over the centuries about crea-

tion "out of nothing" or "out of chaos". The authors of the Old Testament are not clear, and it does not appear to be an important question for them. We do find reference to chaos in Isaiah 45:18,19.

For thus says the Lord
 who created the heavens
 (he is God!),
 who formed the earth and made it
 (he established it;
 he did not create it a chaos,
 he formed it to be inhabited!):
 "I am the Lord, and there is no other.
 I did not speak in secret,
 in a land of darkness;
 I did not say to the offspring of Jacob,
 'Seek me in chaos.'
 I the Lord speak the truth,
 I declare what it right."

The overwhelming message of creation is that God alone is Creator. In contrast to Israel's neighbors, she had no myths abouts gods who battle each other unceasingly for power over man and the natural world. God expressed his solidarity with the world by assuming sole control and establishing world order at the beginning.

God's solidarity with creation and the order of the world did not cease with creation. The timeless perfection of each bud and flower on the altar is a constant reminder of God's order. The fact that the beginning of creation was a once and for all occurrence does not imply that God is like a shipbuilder or watchmaker who abandons his work to someone else. God as Creator is an ever-present reality - always to be understood as being solidarity with the act and meaning of his cration and as being a manifestation of awe-inspiring

but not capricious might.

Secondly, God obviously did not stop with the creation of the heavens, the earth, the animal, and the organic life. He created a creature who would be his counterpart on earth. This part of creation alone he did not create by the word. As Isaiah has said about the world, 'he formed it to be inhabited'. God has revealed his solidarity with the world by giving us a very special place in his creation and sustaining us in all our needs. We are thus challenged to accept him as Lord of history as well as Creator.

As the Psalmist has said, everything God has done is evidence of his "faithfulness" and solidarity to the purpose of his creation. The Lord's character is revealed by his uprightness and by his love for "justice and righteousness". Justice and righteousness are things fundamental to the realm of history and humanity, as well as in nature. There are two words in the Hebrew language which express righteousness. Professor Rolf Knierim of the School of Theology at Claremont understands that one of them corresponds to world order while the other corresponds to attitudes and behavior in accordance with world order. What is being said is that God's justice, righteousness, and love are in perfect accord with his design of the created world. This is important not only because it is a true reflection of God's character but also for the reason that it is the standard for our relationship with him and his world. When we understand righteous-

ness as solidarity, as Professor Knierim has also proposed, we are affirming not only God's relationship with all of his creation but also ourselves as well.

We often concentrate in our Bible study and devotions on God's activity in history while neglecting God's activity in nature, that is, what we can know about it. The same thing happened in ancient Israel. The people were trying consciously to be different from their neighbors who worshiped fertility goddesses, God's miracles in Egypt, his parting of the Red Sea, manna in the desert, and his defeat of Israel's enemies were understood as but a few examples of God's solidarity with the people of Israel. These experiences were so overwhelming, even many generations later, that it took a long time before the Biblical authors began to link their God with the creation of the world. They finally interpreted creation as leading up to God's relationship with them in history.

These same revelations came to my wife and me, as many of you have heard us try to describe our experiences last summer in Israel on an archeological dig. Again and again I have reflected on those eight weeks - getting a 'feel' for the land and the people. Although we spent most of our time excavating the top surface of an ancient city - one which we hope will prove to be Ziklag, David's city in southern Judah given to him by the Philistines - it was often difficult to separate feelings about nature and his-

tory. Without knowledge of God's relationship with the Israelites in their history, it would be very easy to slip into worship of nature alone. Galaxy upon galaxy shone so brightly overhead that I felt I could almost reach up and grab them out of the night sky. I think you can tell that I have been raised in a city. In that region, there is enough water to produce fertile fields and orchards, as in ancient times. If we think about God choosing this land for his people which just happened to be a fertile strip of land surrounded by deserts to the south and east, mountains to the north, and the sea to the west, and which also formed a land bridge between two continents, it is pretty difficult to disguise God's coordination of his activities in creation and history. In such a situation, God's solidarity with the land and the people became very real. As significant as God's relationship with the people of Israel may appear, we should not limit our understanding to his activity to Israel alone. For the early settlers of this country felt similarly blessed, as the name of New Canaan (Connecticut) suggests. Thus, we see that God's justice and righteousness are in perfect accord with his loving concern for the world which he has established and the people whom he has chosen.

Third and finally, we are led to examine our own response to God as Creator and Lord of history. We often find that we are living in a world which we neither understand nor appreciate. There is one member of this congrega-

tion who has been marvelously open with me how little he knows, yet how hard he tries to appreciate God's creation. He is a scientist in his own right - he built the two atomic bombs dropped over Japan; he designed the diesel locomotive; and he has constructed a smokeless (steel) blast furnace. Yet, here is a man who is willing to give thanks to God for his abilities, even though he has sometimes used them for destructive purposes. He has often said that he is ready, even anxious to return to the Creator and Lord of this universe because he wants to know how God makes it all work - why is a particular flower colored each time in exactly the same way; why is every human being different; why do planets and stars not deviate from their course while so far away from their center of orbit? His questions go on and on. Here is a man who knows full well the implications one individual can have on history and God's creation.

The Psalmist whom we heard this morning is instead concerned about those persons who are righteous or upright - who do what is right in the sight of God - yet who do not return thanks. The righteous should not allow their own righteousness to blind their eyes and deafen their ears to solidarity with God. If we may be counted among the righteous, it is good and fitting that we who live in solidarity with God, our fellow humans beings, and all of God's creation, should render thanks to him for our abundant blessings.

We are not by nature whorshiping beings. We take for

granted much of the beauty that is around us. We forget that we owe our very existence to God. So often we need to be reminded about God's initial act, before we in turn affirm our solidarity with him in praise. We have not fulfilled the responsibilities of our relationship with him until we have responded accordingly. The Psalmist urges that we praise God with "the lyre", "the harp of ten strings", singing a "new song", and playing "skillfully on the strings, with loud shouts". Music is just one form of responding to God in praise, yet a profound one at that. While the instruments of those times produced melodies which would sound strange to our ears, it is the spirit of music which is timeless. There is challenge for composers of every age to create new songs. Several years ago, our choir performed a dramatic new composition by Ron Nelson entitled "What Is Man?". This piece is structured on Psalm 8, together with phrases from Genesis 1. Although Ron Nelson has skillfully woven the story of creation into the narration and choral responses, loud shouts frequently crack the air with the word 'freedom'. This composition is a dramatic reminder of the link between God's creation and the gift of freedom. The theme is old, but the song is new. The ineffable job of playing skillfully on the strings or praising him with loud shouts should be an affirmation and a celebration of our solidarity with God as Creator and Lord of history.

Our response expressing solidarity with God may take

many forms, of which music is one. Dante's Garden is another. Not only should our solidarity with God express our relation with him, but with our fellow man as well. You have perhaps heard the story that more than a dozen years ago, when Dante's marriage was falling apart, he hiked one day to the top of Mt. Hollywood. Near the top was an old horse trough, and there he decided to plant a garden. Without permission from anyone, he began to carry plants, shrubs, and trees up to his garden, as well as water. Soon he had friends and fellow hikers planting things in his garden. Without realizing it, Dante not only expressed solidarity with God and his creation, but he has also created a community project. His garden - now an official city park - has become a gathering place for those who just need to talk or wish to contribute something to God's creation. Dante admits that he has used his God-given talents to build a garden in which fellowship, meditation, and worship are welcomed and encouraged. This day, how will you affirm your solidarity with the Creator and the Lord of history?

Sermon 2: A Royal Partnership

I would have you think with me this morning about 'A Royal Partnership' - a partnership between God and the kings of Israel and Judah, and between those rulers and their subjects. Our insight into these relationships is drawn from the Old Testament, and in particular, from the

verses of Jeremiah and Proverbs which we have heard read this morning.

First, we should understand that certain principles which apply to Israelite monarchy may also be applied to other rulers in general. Although we believe Israel to have been a nation set apart from her neighbors, some of her customs have been carried over to our culture through the Biblical traditions. We often hear prayers or pray ourselves for our President, our government leaders, and for the rulers of the nations of the world. What is it that we expect God to do for these leaders? And what is it that we expect these leaders to do for God? Are they instruments in God's kingdom building? These are not unimportant questions to be asking. The annals in the Old Testament of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah represent a distant time and place from our own, yet we may pose the same questions for them. Therefore, it may be helpful if we explore together God's relationship to the king and to the peoples of Israel and Judah.

We can look back with the confidence of hindsight at the entry of the Israelites into the Promised Land - a land flowing with milk and honey - as a new epoch in history. But for the Israelites, it must have seemed like one 'high hurdle' after another. The people of God had to establish their possession of the land by force and infiltration - under the care and direction of their God and charismatic

leaders. These were the Judges whom God raised up. God was their recognized leader. But when the Israelites had taken over some of the cities and the land from the Canaanites, as so often happens, the ways of the conquered became the ways of the conquerors. When Gideon returned successfully from battle, the people asked that he, his son, and his grandson become kings and rule over them. Gideon would have nothing to do with it. He reminded the people that God was their king. How soon they could forget the tyranny of the Pharaoh! Even though all of their neighbors were ruled by kings, the nation of Israel was created by her religion and therefore was different. Israel would be ruled by the one true and invisible king. Although we do not hear of the Kingdom of God until the New Testament, this is clearly what is meant. This type of relationship between God and his people was a hard pill to swallow. After two centuries of violence, bloodshed, and anarchy, God finally consented to have Samuel (the seer) anoint a man to represent him (God). Perhaps the people felt that a king would provide more continuity, instead of raising up another leader when the people once again played the harlot. Throughout history, whether ancient or modern, people have felt the need for the assuring presence of a charismatic leader in a time of crisis. But, as we know, these leaders have usually met the demands of the moment, yet in the long run, they have either been a disappointment or a disaster. Such was Saul's situation.

Not long after Samuel had been instructed to anoint Saul as king, the Lord said: "I regret that I have made Saul king; for he has turned his back from following me, and has not performed my commandments." (I Sam. 15:11)

David's son, Solomon, founded the dynasty in his father's name which would survive nearly four centuries. Society in David's time was still made up of families which gathered together to form clans, which in turn formed tribes. Even though many individuals departed from the family and clan units to live in the cities, there was still a strong sense of tribal solidarity. This continued to cause much jealousy and rivalry between the tribes. David's success as king may be attributed to his remarkable abilities. In a word, he had the 'personality' for the job. He possessed the military prowess to conquer more territory than Israel ever had or would possess; he had the diplomatic skill to choose a neutral capital which would be acceptable to all twelve tribes; and he had the insight to build a tent for the Ark of the Covenant in which God dwelt within in the capital city. David proved himself in three areas which were important in order to be a righteous king. He was the nagid YHWH or charismatic leader of the twelve tribes appointed by the Lord; he was 'bed YHWH or the servant of the Lord; and he was mashiah or the anointed of the Lord upon whom the "Spirit of YHWH came mightly." The rights and duties of the king were set down in writing and were kept in the sanctuary

of the Lord. King David was willing to risk himself for the Lord's cause, and he was handsomely rewarded for it.

The Lord made an eternal covenant with David, despite his human weaknesses. On David's account, the Lord promised that his kingdom would continue forever. The Kingdom of God assumed the form of the kingdom of Israel.

Solomon built the great Temple, as a permanent dwelling place for the Lord, and his palace right next to it, so that the Lord could eternally defend the king. Although the cult of Yahwism began as an ally of the state, it gradually became subservient to the state.

With such potential power and the scope of such responsibilities, is it any wonder, then, that so many kings of Israel and Judah failed in their royal duties? Each king was faced with the almost insurmountable task of serving the Lord as well as the people. Although each king was the representative of the Lord, each fell prey to the advice of the court advisers or the practices of his predecessor rather than the will of the Lord. Many kings were young and inexperienced. Very few kings exercised justice and righteousness, defended the cause of the poor and needy, the widow, and the orphan, or brought dominion and peace to the nations. It seems only right that prayers were requested for the king. (Psalm 72) These were the requirements which tested even the best kings of Israel and Judah. Yet, how often do we, like those ancient kings, look only at the glamor, the wealth,

the power, and the prestige of royalty while forgetting that all of us are servants of the Lord?

Long before Zedekiah - the last king of Judah - was placed on the throne, solidarity between the Lord and the king had turned sour. The Kingdom of God had become a "kingship under judgement." (Bright) It is here that we meet Jeremiah. As we read the words of Jeremiah with an eye open to the historical facts - more than a century earlier the northern kingdom of Israel had been destroyed and now king Jehoiachin and all the important leaders of Judah had been exiled to Babylon - we can begin to feel Jeremiah's deep pain and longing for better days. The uncle of Jehoiachin, Mattaniah, was placed on the throne by Nebuchadrezzar, even though he was a young man of 21. Mattaniah's name was changed to Zedekiah which means "The Lord is my righteousness". Jeremiah had nothing against Zedekiah - the king occasionally called upon him for advice - but Jeremiah was obviously disappointed because Zedekiah listened to bad advice from his advisers. That has a familiar ring to it - doesn't it? Therefore, Jeremiah prophesied:

Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his day Judah will be saved, and Israel will dwell securely. And this is the name by which he will be called: 'The Lord is our righteousness'." (Jer. 23:5,6)

Do you see the picture? The Lord will raise up a new king for David - 'for' David - who will restore the Davidic

kingdom once again. A righteous Branch can mean a legitimate heir. The Hebrew word which means 'The Lord is our righteousness' is a play on the name Zedekiah, which may explain that Jeremiah expects the future king to live up to Zedekiah's name. The Lord is our righteousness also has the meaning of salvation or deliverance, as well as referring to the character of our king.

As we know, the Jewish people waited with increasing expectation for the coming of the Messiah who would once again restore the Davidic dynasty to its former glory. Although we believe, as Christians, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah (the anointed one), we can see that he did not fulfill his Jewish followers' expectations, as a wise king who would execute justice and righteousness in the land and restore Israel and Judah to their former Davidic glory.

Perhaps you have as much difficulty as I do relating to the kings of Israel and Judah. Yet the king is an important figure in the traditions of our faith and is a person who needs to be understood. Our American counterpart to those ancient kings obviously represents a very different system of government, but there are also similarities. The reason, in part, that we have a president rather than a king is due to the abuse of royal powers. Monarchs have seldom remembered their responsibility as servants of God and of the people. James I of England, who was also the head of the English Church, claimed that the king was above the Law.

The truth is that none of us stands above the law, for even David felt the sting of Nathan's rebuke.

George Washington began as Commander-in-Chief of the army, with duties similar to those of Saul. But when Washington became president, as David had become king, it was as much their personalities as anything else which shaped their offices. Since the tyranny of George III of England still smoldered within the hearts and minds of the American people, Washington wisely chose not to allow the people to address him as King George. Therefore, his son and grandson would not follow him as rulers of the republic. Our Founding Fathers instead chose to trust in the wisdom of the people. Although the people were encouraged to pray for their president, Jefferson sought to build a wall between the church and the state, in order to protect the freedom of both.

The second part of the royal partnership is the relationship of the king and the people. We hold an important role in the sustenance of the kingdom. For in the wise words of the writer of Proverbs, it is written:

It is an abomination to kings to do evil, for the throne is established by righteousness.

Righteous lips are the delight of a king, and loves him who speaks what is right. (Prov. 16:12,13)

Although kings are mentioned here, we may apply this maxim to all rulers. It is important that just as the righteous king or ruler ought to be concerned about our needs and rights, so should we be concerned about acting justly and

righteously. It is an abomination to rulers rather than the Lord, if we commit evil. If a king or ruler acts righteously, he should have no fears about the security of his powers. Those who are elected rather than born to rule are more open to accountability. If we understand righteousness as solidarity, as Professor Rolf Knierim at the School of Theology at Claremont has done, we can see that we have a tremendous responsibility not only as individual citizens but also as a Christian community. When our righteous behavior expresses solidarity with the king or ruler in power, we are contributing something of significant value to the establishment of the government. If, on the other hand, we contribute to crime, anarchy, wastefulness, slander, injustice, mistrust, and abuse of free speech or freedom of religion, we have neither acted righteously nor are we in solidarity with our leader. Righteousness is not a standard for judging our behavior or that of others, but instead, is the fulfillment of our relationships with others and God. Solidarity with our leaders does not mean that we always agree with what they do. Yet this should not prevent us from keeping the President, our government leaders, and the leaders of the nations in our prayers. For solidarity with God by the rulers of all the nations and ourselves will contribute right behavior and a positive attitude to God's Kingdom building.

Sermon 3: Christian Solidarity

We have heard this morning a passage from Isaiah and another from Romans. Each, as we shall see, speaks its own word to the meaning of Christian solidarity. Solidarity is a word we often use to express 'oneness', 'togetherness', or 'fellowship'. Yet 'Christian solidarity' expresses something far deeper and more profound. Christian solidarity is the essence of our relationships with God and with our fellow man. Christian worship is meant to be an affirmation of these relationships - reflecting our responsibilities to God and to one another - but sometimes worship does not accomplish this.

I am sure that many of you who have been to our nation's capital have seen the twin towers of the Washington Cathedral in the distance. Perhaps you visited it or worshiped there. You were probably as impressed as I was by its staggering immensity. Anyone who has been there will not soon forget the beauty of the small chapels and altars, the intricate masonry and wood carvings, the deep hues in the stained glass windows, and the high vaulted ceilings. This great Cathedral stands as a living monument to the vision of those who since 1791 have sought to erect a "House of Prayer for All People". This Cathedral represents not only the corporate achievement of a Christian community, but also a labor of love by individuals - fashioned out of wood, glass

and stone. On the main altar are carved ninety-six figures, including six which represent ministry to the hungry, the stranger, the sick, the thirsty, the naked, and the prisoner. But what are we to make of this magnificent, national Cathedral in light of the passages we have heard read this morning? Can a costly Cathedral reflect true commitment by Christians to their God and their fellow man?

Within our Judeo-Christian tradition, the passage from Isaiah offers a partial answer. Picture with me, if you would, a land decimated by years of war and neglect and a people divided by exile. Through the eyes of a man whom we shall call Third Isaiah, we know about the return of the Jews from Babylon. The Jews returned to their beloved city intent upon rebuilding the city walls and restoring the Solomonic Temple to its former glory. The Temple had been damaged by the Babylonians. The restoration of the House of the Lord was a reflection of their commitment. Each year in remembrance of this judgement upon the Temple, they set aside a day of fasting for prayer and penitence.

The people perhaps responded at first in sincere repentance. But as so often happens, the meaning of the fast was lost, and the ritual became an empty shell. This is not unlike our own times. Days of remembrance, such as Veteran's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, and Memorial Day no longer express their original intention for most of us. They have merely become 'three-day weekends'.

Isaiah was intimately aware of these problems. The nation believed that it had acted righteously, as if the people did not sin or violate God's commandments. God echoes the thoughts of his people: "Why does God take no notice of our fasts? We observe the appropriate rites, but there is no answer." Solidarity with God represents far more than the observance of rites. Right behavior must be accompanied by a sincere attitude of faith. A hollow ritual is one which we observe only in order to feel good about the fact of doing it, yet the ritual does not facilitate solidarity with God. For God requires of his believers a different kind of fast - one that expresses solidarity with one's fellow man as well. The Lord said, the kind of fast I want is for you

"...to loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the thongs of the yoke, to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke...to share your bread with the hungry, and bring the homeless into your house...(when you) see the naked, to cover him, and not to hide yourself from your own flesh."

The repentance which God requires of us is to care for one another.

Now let us couple this word from Third Isaiah with the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters of Paul's Letter to the Romans which we have heard read this morning. Paul is writing to the Christian community in Rome (which may include more than one congregation). The early church had many problems, yet none was so significant as the establishment of its own identity - as individuals and as a community.

Many of the early converts to Christianity were Jews, and they could not be expected to forget their heritage easily. How was a Christian supposed to act and to worship? Would it be acceptable for former Jews to express their faith by practicing the dietary customs of the Law? Trouble arose when pagan converts who had little or no knowledge of these traditions joined this mixed community of pagans and former Jews. Those persons 'strong in faith' despised those 'weak in faith' who accepted the yoke of the Law, the dietary laws, festivals, the sanctity of the Sabbath, and kinship with Abraham and Moses. The strong in faith believed that these were only used as props to substantiate the faith of the weak. The strong in faith believed that every day was holy. The third party in this "Eternal Triangle" were the doubters. Each of the other parties attempted to woo them to their side. Although Paul was a former Jew, he identified himself with the strong when he said: "We who are strong ought to bear with the failings of the weak, and not to please ourselves; let each of us please his neighbor for his good, to edify him." (Rom. 15:1,2)

How is it that Christians should be despising and scorning one another? What happened to the fire and spirit of brotherhood at Pentecost? This community problem is reminiscent of God's problem with the Israelites: "...you fast only to seek your own pleasure....Behold, you fast

only to quarrel and to fit and to hit with wicked fist."

(Is. 58:3b-4a) Although each of us must give account for him-/herself, he/she must also care for his/her brothers and sisters in Christ. As Paul has said:

. For the kingdom of God does not mean food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit; he who thus serves Christ is acceptable to God and approved by men. Let us pursue what makes for peace and mutual upbuilding. (Rom. 14:17-19)

Christ came not to abolish the Law but instead to fulfill it. Although we are thereby freed from the dietary laws, we are still obligated to uphold God's moral laws. This latter requirement need not be a burden, for by the power of the Holy Spirit we are empowered to live in righteousness and joy and peace. Paul sought to move away from the Jewish idea of forensic or judicial righteousness towards righteousness based on relationships. For it is this type of righteousness which contributes to solidarity within a Christian community.

Let us look at this in another way. As Christians, we are related to God through our belief in him, but we are also bound to one another as members of this Christian community, as well as people around the globe. We can picture our relationship with God as a vertical dimension, while our relation to our fellow human beings is a horizontal dimension. However, these relationships are not exclusive of one another, since we may also speak of solidarity with God and righteousness which affects our fellow man. Professor

Rolf Knierim has therefore proposed that we understand righteousness as solidarity. The emphasis is placed upon our relationships rather than a standard for behavior. Righteousness as solidarity is intended to express both a spiritual relationship with God and a social relationship with our fellow man.

All of us are set within a multitude of relationships: husband with wife; parents with their children; employees with their bosses; members of this congregation with friends and one another; as well as visitors and the needy; and all of us with God. We all have to relate to one another. It is as basic as that. We, of course, have different sets of relationships than those in Isaiah's or Paul's times, yet it can still be said: "None of us lives to himself, and none of us dies to himself. If we live, we live to the Lord, if we die, we die to the Lord; so then, whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's."

(Rom. 14:7,8) If we live in Christian solidarity, we live in relationship to Christ. Righteousness is not something which separates us from others, like a spiritual cocoon, but instead symbolizes the most basic relationships which we must encounter every day and which give meaning to our very existence. If we would stand in solidarity with God as members of this or any other Christian community, we must care for the poor, the widow, the orphan, and the alien, as well as being supportive of one another. God's

demands of us are not as complicated as they might seem. We repeat them each week. Solidarity requires of us that we love the Lord our God with all our hearts and with all our souls, with all our strength and with all our minds, AND our neighbors as ourselves. That is the summation of our vertical and horizontal, spiritual and social relationships.

We have hear considerable criticism in recent times about the irresponsibility of building an enormous cathedral when so many people in the world go to bed hungry or are ill-clothed. Some feel that Christians should meet in homes, thereby dispensing with the expense of a church building. The money could, therefore, be devoted to the needs of the people. Jesus said: "For you always have the poor with you, but you will not always have me." This is not to be used as an excuse to neglect the poor, for they must always be our concern. But the Washington community has done a beautiful thing. The architects, builders, stonecutters, woodcarvers, and countless devoted Christian patrons have undertaken the building of this House of Prayer in an act of faith to the glory of their God. An even more remarkable story is that of Coventry Cathedral in England which arose from its ashes after the Second World War because of Christian patrons around the globe, including Germans, so that the Cathedral might implement a dynamic ministry to the city in which it is found. These problems

are not so far away as Washington or Coventry. We have similar problems in our own community. Yet we must not allow the destruction of a Temple or the construction of a Cathedral to represent our entire commitment to God. Worthy though these projects may be, they must not come between us and our relationship with God. The Scriptures challenge us to live in solidarity with God and with our neighbor. We must not neglect either the spiritual or the social dimension of our daily lives if in true worship we are to express Christian solidarity.

We have considered many things together this morning. Our lives lived in solidarity with God and with the person sitting beside, behind, or in front of us opens up such possibilities for a meaningful Christian life that it boggles the mind. Solidarity is both a challenge and an adventure, as worship and service should be. The requirements of God are unambiguous. In the Old and New Testaments, God has set forth principles for a more meaningful life which each of us can lead. He has set forth a plan of his eternal scheme. We are to exist not only as individual Christians, but also as members of his spiritual community, whether that be in a tiny country church or a great city cathedral. We are inheritors of the eternal legacy of his church. This places responsibilities on each of us every day of the week. Fulfilling the demands of spiritual and social relationships has always been a difficult requirement

to achieve, and many have fallen by the wayside. Have we been asking God the wrong questions? Have we been seeking God where he is not to be found? You and I are called to accept the challenge of solidarity by loosing the bonds of wickedness, sharing bread with the hungry, and covering the naked. For

"...then shall your light break forth like the dawn, and your healing shall spring up speedily; your righteousness shall go before you, the glory of the Lord shall be your rear guard. Then shall you call, and the Lord will answer; you shall cry, and he will say, Here I am."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achtemeier, Elizabeth. The Old Testament and the Proclamation of the Gospel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973.

_____. "Righteousness in the OT," in Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. IV, 80-85.

Achtemeier, Paul. "Righteousness in the NT," in Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. IV, 91-99.

Anderson, A.A. The Book of Psalms (New Century Bible) London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1972.

Baltzer, Klaus. The Covenant Formulary: in Old Testament, Jewish, and Early Christian Writings, trans. by David Green. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Barth, Karl. The Epistle to the Romans, trans. by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

_____. Church Dogmatics. 4 vols. in 13. Edinburgh: Clark, 1960.

Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

Brunner, Emil. The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, trans by Olive Wyon. (Dogmatics: Vol. II). Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1952.

_____. Justice and the Social Order, trans. by Mary Hottinger. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945.

Bultmann, Rudolf. Theology of the New Testament, trans. by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. in 1. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.

Conzelmann, Hans. An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, trans. by John Bowden. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Cross, Frank Moore. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Daly, Denis. God and History in the Old Testament. The Encounter with the Absolute Other in Ancient Israel. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.

- Daniel-Rops, H. The Church of the Apostles and Martyrs, trans. by Audrey Butler. London: Dent, 1960.
- Deissmann, Adolf. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. by William Wilson. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1968.
- Eichrodt, Walther. Theology of the Old Testament, trans. by J.A. Baker. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.
- Fohrer, Georg. History of Israelite Religion, trans. by David Green. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- Gager, John. Kingdom and Community. The Social World of Early Christianity. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975.
- Goguel, Maurice. The Primitive Church, trans. by H.C. Snape. New York: Macmillan, 1964.
- Harrelson, W.J. "Law in the OT," in Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. III, 77-89.
- Hengel, Martin. Property and Riches in the Early Church. Aspects of a Social History of Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Hiller, Delbert. Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1969.
- Howe, Reuel. The Miracle of Dialogue. New York: Seabury Press, 1963.
- Kümmel, Werner. The Theology of the New Testament. According to its Major Witnesses: Jesus-Paul-John, trans. by John Seely. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973.
- Laurin, Robert (ed.) Contemporary Old Testament Theologians. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1970.
- McCarthy, D.J. Old Testament Covenant. A Survey of Current Opinions. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1972.
- McKaine, W. Proverbs. A New Approach. (Old Testament Library) Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.
- May, Herbert G. "Aspects of the Imagery of World Dominion and World State in the Old Testament," in J.L. Crenshaw and J.T. Willis (eds.) Essays in OT Ethics. New York: KTAV, 1974.

Mendenhall, G.E. "Covenant," in Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. I, 719-23.

_____. "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine." Biblical Archaeologist, XXV: 3 (1962), 66-87.

_____. Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East. Pittsburgh: Presbyterian Board of Colportage of Western Pennsylvania, 1955.

_____. The Tenth Generation. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Minear, Paul. Images of the Church in the New Testament. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

_____. The Obedience of Faith. The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle of Paul to the Romans (Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series, No. 19) Naperville: Allenson, 1971.

Muilenburg, James. The Way of Israel. Biblical Faith and Ethics. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.

Müller, Christian. Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk. Eine Untersuchung zu Römer 9-11. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.

Munck, Johannes. Christ & Israel. An Interpretation of Romans 9-11. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. The Responsible Self. An Essay in Christian Moral Philosophy. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Noth, Martin. The History of Israel. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

Porter, J.R. The Extended Family in the Old Testament (Occasional Papers in Social and Economic Administration, No. 6) London: Edutext, 1967.

Pritchard, James (ed.). The Ancient Near East. An Anthology of Texts and Pictures. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Rad, Gerhard von. Biblical Interpretations in Preaching, trans. by John Seely. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1977.

_____. Old Testament Theology. The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions, trans. by D.M.G. Stalker. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

- _____. The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, trans. by E.W. Trueman Dicken. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- _____. Wisdom in Israel. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- Scharbert, Josef. Solidarität in Segen und Fluch im Alten Testament und in seiner Umwelt. Bonn: Hanstein, 1958.
- Schlatter, Adolf. The Church in the New Testament Period, trans. by Paul Levertoff. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- Schmid, Hans. Altorientalische Welt in der altestamentlichen Theologie. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1974.
- _____. Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung: Hintergrund und Geschichte des altestamentlichen Gerechtigkeitbegriffes (Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, 40) Tübingen: Mohr, 1968.
- Shedd, Russell P. Man in Community. A Study of St. Paul's Application of Old Testament and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity. London: Epworth Press, 1958.
- Smend, Rudolf. Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation. Reflections on Israel's Earliest History, trans. by Max Gray Rogers. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Snaith, Norman. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.
- Stadelmann, Luis J. The Hebrew Conception of the World (Analecta Biblica, 39) Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paul. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Sweetnam, James. "Some Observations on the Background of פ"ת in Jeremias 23,5a," Biblica, XLVI (1965), 29-40.
- Thomson, J.A. The Ancient Near Eastern Treaties and the Old Testament. London: Tyndale Press, 1964.
- Vaux, Roland de. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, trans. by John McHugh. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- _____. The Bible and the Ancient Near East, trans. by Damian McHugh. Garden City: Doubleday, 1971.
- Westermann, Claus. Creation, trans. by John Scullion. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Whedbee, J. William. Isaiah & Wisdom. Nashville: Abingdon

Press, 1971.

Wolff, Hans W. Anthropology of the Old Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

Ziesler, J.A. The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul. A Linguistic and Theological Inquiry. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Zimmerli, W. The Law and the Prophets. A Study of the Meaning of the Old Testament, trans. by R.E. Clements. Oxford: Blackwell, 1965.